# Daily Report

# Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-039
Wednesday
27 February 1991

# Daily Report
## Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-039 27 February 1991

CONTENTS

**NOTICE TO READERS:** An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.


**ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT**

Obukhov: U.S. 'Inconsistency' Hampers START *[PRAVDA 27 Feb]* ..... 1
PRAVDA Urges CSCE-Type Process for Asia *[23 Feb]* ..... 2
CSCE Committee Discusses Security Interests *[TASS]* ..... 3
Europe Institute Researcher Views CFE Treaty *[IAN PRESS RELEASE]* ..... 3

**WARSAW PACT AFFAIRS**

PRAVDA Reports Protocol Winding Up Warsaw Pact *[26 Feb]* ..... 5
Pact Commander Lushev Views Warsaw Pact's End *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 23 Feb]* ..... 5
CEMA Session Postponed, Future Assessed *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 6
CSFR Concern Over Eastern 'Threat' Reported *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 7
NATO Spokesman Cited on Organization's Future *[TASS]* ..... 8

**WORLDWIDE ISSUES**

Churkin on Soviet Interest Section in Pretoria *[TASS]* ..... 9

**INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

**Northeast Asia**

Economic Talks Begin With South Korea *[TASS]* ..... 10
1990 Trade Reportedly $1 Billion *[Moscow International]* ..... 10
Sovereignty Issue 'Impeding' Ties With Japan *[IZVESTIYA 23 Feb]* ..... 10
Hokkaido Delegation Visits Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk *[IZVESTIYA 19 Feb]* ..... 10

**Near East & South Asia**

Ignatenko Discusses Iraqi Future 26 Feb *[TASS]* ..... 11
Belonogov Comments on Post-Crisis Iraq *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 11
Reports View Ground Offensive, Peace Efforts ..... 12
U.S. Stand 'Hardening' *[PRAVDA 27 Feb]* ..... 12
Iraqi 'Staunchness,' 'Valor' Lauded *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 27 Feb]* ..... 12
U.S. Urged to Show 'Benevolence' *[TASS]* ..... 13
Saddam Withdrawal Statement Viewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 27 Feb]* ..... 14
Peace Plan Gaining 'Second Wind' *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 14
U.S. Said To Want Control of Oil *[RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 26 Feb]* ..... 15
Official Views Gulf Peace Efforts *[London TV]* ..... 15
Kuwaiti Envoy on 'Firm Basis' of Soviet Ties *[IZVESTIYA 26 Feb]* ..... 16
Soviet Destroyer Arrives in Alexandria, Egypt *[TASS]* ..... 17
Afghan Rebels Said Holding 100 Soviet Servicemen *[TASS]* ..... 17
Diplomat Comments on Relations With Afghanistan *[TASS]* ..... 17
Reports Mark 2d Afghan Withdrawal Anniversary ..... 18
Political Situation Assessed *[PRAVDA 15 Feb]* ..... 18
Peace Prospects Viewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Feb]* ..... 20

**East Europe**

Charge d'Affaires to Albania Arrives in Tirana *[TASS]* ..... 21
Commentator Views Future Ties With Poland *[NEW TIMES 12-18 Feb]* ..... 21

TASS Obvserver on Relations With CEMA ..... 22
Former Bloc Countries' Wish To Cut Links Noted *[IZVESTIYA 20 Feb]* ..... 22

**West Europe**

Yanayev Meets With German President 24 Feb *[Berlin ADN]* ..... 23
Western Forces Commander Meets With Genscher *[TASS]* ..... 23
More Cash Wanted for Withdrawal From FRG *[Berlin ADN]* ..... 23
EC's Mixing of Politics, Business Criticized *[PRAVDA 25 Feb]* ..... 24
Bessmertnykh on European Culture Cooperation *[IZVESTIYA 23 Feb]* ..... 24

**NATIONAL AFFAIRS**

**Supreme Soviet**

USSR Supreme Soviet 25 Feb Session *[Moscow TV]* ..... 26
Pavlov Speaks at Session *[Moscow TV]* ..... 28
Deputies Discuss Pavlov Report *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 31
Referendum Resolution Adopted *[PRAVDA 26 Feb]* ..... 32

**Political & Social**

Democratic Russia Urges 'No' Vote on Referendum *[TASS]* ..... 33
Republic Representatives Discuss Union Treaty *[Moscow TV]* ..... 34
More on CPSU Secretariat Session on Referendum *[PRAVDA 25 Feb]* ..... 34
CPSU Property Worth 4.9 Billion Rubles *[IZVESTIYA 22 Feb]* ..... 36
Nishanov Interviewed on Union Treaty *[PRAVDA 22 Feb]* ..... 36
Supreme Soviet Referendum Measures Questioned *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 26 Feb]* ..... 37
Colonel Alksnis Says 'No Avoiding Civil War' *[MOSCOW NEWS No 6]* ..... 38
Bovin Article Argues for Retaining USSR *[IZVESTIYA 22 Feb]* ..... 40
Confidence in Reforms Encouraged *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 7]* ..... 42
Loss of Faith in 'Democrats' Examined *[PRAVDA 21 Feb]* ..... 43
Anti-Leadership Tone at Yeltsin Rally *[PRAVDA 25 Feb]* ..... 44
Pavlov News Conference on Economic Planning *[IZVESTIYA 25 Feb]* ..... 45
Pavlov Asks To Resign From 'Business World' Chair *[TASS]* ..... 46
Dzasokhov Addresses Education Conference *[PRAVDA 20 Feb]* ..... 46
Yanayev Meets German Congress Representatives *[TASS]* ..... 46
Yanayev Presents Awards To Space Achievers *[IZVESTIYA 25 Feb]* ..... 47
CPSU's Stroyev Visits Political Base in Orel *[PRAVDA 25 Feb]* ..... 47
Local Deputy Hides 'Insult' To MD Commander *[PRAVDA 25 Feb]* ..... 47
Poll Shows Support for CPSU *[Moscow International]* ..... 48

**Economic**

OECD Says USSR No Longer 'Good Risk' *[AFP]* ..... 48
New Details on Ekho Deal Disclosed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 21 Feb]* ..... 49
Delivery Problems Stop Industrial Production *[IZVESTIYA 22 Feb]* ..... 52

**Agricultural**

Pavlov Chairs Cabinet Session on Farming *[IZVESTIYA 25 Feb]* ..... 53
Allows Trading Merchandise for Grain *[IZVESTIYA 25 Feb]* ..... 53

**Scientific**

Cosmos 2135 Launched Successfully 26 Feb *[TASS]* ..... 54
Cosmonauts Study Heat-Mass Exchange *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 54
Two Britons Resume Cosmonaut Training *[TASS]* ..... 54

### Military

Defense Minister Yazov Views Pact, Gulf War *[Moscow International]* ..... 55
Yazov in Honor Guard at Shkadov Lying in State *[PRAVDA 21 Feb]* ..... 55
Moiseyev Reaffirms Army's Mission *[TASS]* ..... 55
MPD Chief Shlyaga Visits Troops in Germany *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Feb]* ..... 56
Manezhnaya Rally Backs Union, 'Unified' Army *[IZVESTIYA 25 Feb]* ..... 56
Varennikov, Others Sign General's Obituary *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 21 Feb]* ..... 56

## REGIONAL AFFAIRS

### Baltic Republics

Baltic Leaders Attend Nordic Council Session *[Tallinn Radio]* ..... 57
Danish Premier Receives Delegations *[Radio Vilnius]* ..... 57
Paratroopers Break Into Lithuanian TV Tower *[Radio Vilnius]* ..... 57
Lithuania Announces Price Hikes, Compensation *[Radio Vilnius]* ..... 57
Lithuanian Radio Second Program Returns to Air *[Radio Vilnius]* ..... 58
Lithuanian Appeals to UN on USSR 'Aggression' *[EKHO LITVY 9 Feb]* ..... 58
Godmanis Briefs Press on Relations With Center *[TASS]* ..... 59
Russian Democrats Support Latvian Independence *[Riga International]* ..... 59
Deputies Seek Nullification of Latvia Treaty *[Riga International]* ..... 59
3 March Poll Available to Latvians in Sweden *[Riga Radio]* ..... 59
Riga Militia Headquarters To Be Disbanded *[Moscow TV]* ..... 59
Radio Rossii Interviews Latvia's Gorbunovs ..... 59
Lithuanian CP's Jermalavicius Interviewed *[EKHO LITVY 12 Feb]* ..... 61
Latvian Strike Committee on 16 Jan Explosion *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 19 Jan]* ..... 62
Belief Riga 'Returning to Normal' Disputed *[PRAVDA 18 Feb]* ..... 62
Ruutel Speaks 24 Feb on Estonian Independence *[Tallinn Radio]* ..... 63
Interrepublic 'Consultative Committee' Meets *[IZVESTIYA 25 Feb]* ..... 63
Estonian Speaker Meets With USSR's Laverov *[Tallinn Radio]* ..... 64
Estonian Legislature Debates Tax Issues *[TASS]* ..... 64
Estonian Deputies Recall Bill on Pay Raises *[TASS]* ..... 64
Government Says Drunks Caused Tallinn Explosion *[IZVESTIYA 25 Feb]* ..... 64
Estonian Separatists Said Stifling Debate *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 19 Feb]* ..... 64

### RSFSR

RSFSR Prepares for 17 March Referendums *[TASS]* ..... 67
Kaliningrad Residents Polled on Referendum *[Kaliningrad Maritime]* ..... 67
Buryat Congress Appeals for Union Preservation *[TASS]* ..... 67
RSFSR Deputies Criticize Yeltsin's TV Remarks *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Feb]* ..... 67
Yeltsin CNN Remarks on Gorbachev Assailed *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Feb]* ..... 68
Commentary Warns of Military Dictatorship *[Radio Rossii]* ..... 70
RSFSR Deputy Ponders Republic Flag, Emblem *[TASS]* ..... 70
Supreme Soviet Presidium Session Held 25 Feb *[Moscow TV]* ..... 71
Russian-Turkish Agreements Signed in Ankara *[TASS]* ..... 71
More on Commission Findings on KGB Bugging Claims *[PRAVDA 26 Feb]* ..... 71
Smolensk Rejects 'Special Regime' Proposal *[IZVESTIYA 21 Feb]* ..... 72
Prokofyev Sees 'Fascists' at Work in Lithuania *[IZVESTIYA 25 Feb]* ..... 72
Communist Party's Polozkov on Attitudes to Army *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 22 Feb]* ..... 72
Communist Party Plenum Documents Published *[VETERAN No 7]* ..... 75

### Western Republics

President Gorbachev Visits Minsk, Gomel Oblast ..... 77
Arrives in Minsk *[Moscow TV]* ..... 77
Visits Tractor Factory *[TASS]* ..... 77
Addresses Tractor Workers *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 77
TASS Notes Remarks on Yeltsin ..... 83
Points Out U.S., Gulf Comments *[TASS]* ..... 84

Gorbachev Pledges Chernobyl Funds *[TASS]* ..... 84
Meets Unionists, Intelligentsia *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 84
Departs for Gomel Oblast *[TASS]* ..... 85
Arrives in Vetka District *[TASS]* ..... 85
More on Belorussia Chernobyl Compensation Law *[TASS]* ..... 85
Donbass Committees Meet on Anticipated Strike *[TASS]* ..... 85
Czechoslovak-Ukrainian Talks on Repatriation Start
*[Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA 25 Feb]* ..... 86
Ukraine, Lithuania Sign Economic, Trade Protocol *[Vilnius International]* ..... 86

**Caucasus**

Georgia's Gamsakhurdia Sends Letter to Lukyanov *[Tbilisi Radio]* ..... 86
Georgian Interior Ministry Continues Arms Seizures *[TASS]* ..... 87
Georgian Leader Discounts S. Ossetian Statehood *[Moscow TV]* ..... 87
'Extremely Tense Situation' in South Ossetia *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 87
Oleynik Interviewed on South Ossetia Situation *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 26 Feb]* ..... 88
South Ossetia Held in 'Firm Grip' of Blockade *[Moscow Radio]* ..... 91
Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan on Talks About NKAO *[Yerevan Radio]* ..... 91

## Obukhov: U.S. 'Inconsistency' Hampers START

*PM2602221591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian*
*27 Feb 91 First Edition p 6*

[Interview with USSR Deputy Foreign Minister A.A. Obukhov by unidentified PRAVDA correspondent; date and place not given: "February Round; Strategic Offensive Arms Treaty: Consultations Under Way"]

[Text] As already reported in PRAVDA, in mid-February USSR Deputy Foreign Minister A.A. Obukhov visited Geneva, where he held consultations with U.S. representatives on questions of preparing the strategic offensive arms treaty. In our 7 February edition A.A. Obukhov described the aims of his visit. Today he answers a PRAVDA correspondent's questions about the results of the February round of consultations.

[PRAVDA] What is your opinion of the results of the consultations with U.S. representatives?

[Obukhov] We had an extremely full exchange of opinions. A serious attempt was made to "close" all remaining questions relating to the preparation of the strategic offensive arms treaty. The participants in the consultations succeeded in making progress in some areas. Unfortunately, however, the main task—totally getting rid of the disagreements and opening the way to officially typing up a draft strategic offensive arms treaty agreed in every detail—still remains unfulfilled.

[PRAVDA] What is the reason for this state of affairs at the talks?

[Obukhov] In my view, the main thing now is to fully implement the well known "Houston accords." The drafts that have been prepared embody a large proportion of the package agreed by the USSR and U.S. foreign ministers last December in Houston. But not the whole "package," nonetheless. Our U.S. partners' inconsistency is taking its toll here. What is more, they put forward a number of new, complex approaches at the last minute, during the final lap of the talks. This does not help maintain the high pace of discussions that is so necessary now.

It must be clear: There is no doubt regarding all the most important fundamental questions relating to the future treaty. They have been resolved. But a number of remaining essential details with respect to verification of aviation, counting missile warheads, verification of throw-weight, etc, need to be settled.

[PRAVDA] Reports have appeared in the Western press blaming the Soviet side for the holdups at the talks. There have been hints that this is the result of military circles' increasing influence on our foreign policy. How fair are these reproaches?

[Obukhov] These arguments are unfounded. The line pursued by the Soviet Union and our president is open and definite. The USSR is resolutely in favor of a strategic offensive arms treaty that would be of invaluable significance for strengthening international security and trust and for further weakening the threat of nuclear war. In its practical work the USSR Foreign Ministry firmly proceeds from these principled directives by our leadership and works vigorously to implement them.

As for our military department's involvement in formulating positions and directly in the negotiating process itself, this is a quite normal process. Vitally important military-political problems are being resolved at the talks and we cannot do without the involvement of the relevant specialists here.

For more than 20 years I have in one way or another been involved in talks with the United States on nuclear issues. Throughout this period I have maintained productive and businesslike contacts with the military. I think that military representatives also derive some benefit from their contacts with diplomats.

Are there disputes when preparing our positions? Of course. But disputes cannot be avoided, even among diplomats themselves. The truth emerges from debate.

I would say more: Discussions—comprehensive and profound discussions, moreover—are necessary, since we are talking about questions that determine the strategic balance. A mistake may undermine the stability that we are trying to strengthen.

Interdepartmental coordination of a unified position based on the political leadership's directives and on science is, in my view, an immutable law of the talks. Departmental equality is clearly maintained in this. As a result of this coordination—which is subject to the leadership's approval—our position at the talks expresses the USSR's statewide interest in the sphere in question in light of a whole range of factors—economic, military, political, social, etc. I think that this is also how people in the United States approach this question.

[PRAVDA] Our press often talks now about excessive concessions to the U.S. side at the talks. Is that a correct assessment?

[Obukhov] Concessions cannot be avoided at talks. Any agreement represents a compromise. But for an agreement to be equitable, the concessions must be mutual and reciprocal. That is what happens in real life. Things must be judged on the end result—the specific substance of the agreement. Now no one can impose unequitable agreements on one another. This is guaranteed by the involvement in the talks of large collectives of people and various departments vested with proper responsibility. The sides' legislative organs also keep an attentive eye on the negotiating process itself.

[PRAVDA] Is a fresh round of consultations with the United States on strategic offensive arms questions expected? After all, time is pressing.

[Obukhov] Indeed, time is short.

Our minister, A.A. Bessmertnykh, agreed in January with the U.S. leadership to complete work on the treaty within a few weeks. We want to keep to this deadline. This week we are going to Geneva again to "attack" —for the last time, I hope—the remaining problems with the delegations. We will expect reciprocal constructiveness from our partners. The good chance—of completing in a very short time work on a treaty on which several years have now been spent—must not be lost.

## PRAVDA Urges CSCE-Type Process for Asia

*PM2602124191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Feb 91 Second Edition p 5*

[Vsevolod Ovchinnikov "View From Moscow": "From Vladivostok To San Francisco"]

[Text] Vienna in February proved to be unlike Paris in November. Remember the grand obsequies for the Cold War last fall, when the leaders of 34 states signed in the French capital a Charter for a New Europe and a Treaty on the Reduction of Conventional Armed Forces from the Atlantic to the Urals. Three months on, talks have resumed in Vienna aimed at limiting the number of personnel, elaborating extra stability measures, and agreeing on the procedure for aerial inspections.

But the current atmosphere in Vienna is most unlike the euphoria of Paris in November. The United States and other NATO members have sharply criticized the Soviet Union. It is accused, in the first place, of moving beyond the Urals a large quantity of tanks, armored personnel carriers, guns, and aircraft that are subject to cuts. Second, of including several combined-arms divisions in the naval forces which, on U.S. insistence, are not affected by the Paris treaty.

I do not want to perform the role of prosecutor or advocate in this connection. Certainly the cause of the West's concern must be removed. But if we think about the essential causes of the complications rather than the symptoms, the obvious conclusion is that disarmament can only be really effective if it becomes worldwide, covering all regions of the planet and all categories of modern weapons.

Can the Soviet Union join a European Community represented by only one-third of its territory? Is it not time to expand the framework of the Helsinki process? (Not "from the Atlantic to the Urals," but "from Vladivostok to San Francisco") Is it not time to bring naval armaments into the negotiations, without which the discussion of security problems in the Asia-Pacific region is futile? If these questions had been promptly solved there would have been no need to move combat equipment beyond the Urals or incorporate combined-arms units in the navy.

The USSR has long proposed using the example and experience of Europe to improve the situation in Asia. In its view, the peace-loving communities formed on these two continents would in time merge, resulting in a single security system throughout the Eurasian space. The Soviet initiatives put forward in 1986 in Vladivostok are geared to precisely this in the long term.

The USSR urged a joint quest for ways of building confidence in the Asia-Pacific region and proposed a comprehensive action program in five areas. Let me remind you of them: settling regional conflicts, preventing the spread of nuclear weapons in the region, restricting naval activities and military presence generally in the Pacific and Indian Oceans, radically reducing armed forces and conventional armaments in Asia, and embarking on the elaboration of confidence-building measures.

All these pointers remain topical to this day. And the Soviet Union has proved its dedication to them in practice by a series of unilateral steps, among other things. As is known, it has reduced armed forces in the Asian part of the country by 200,000 and significantly reduced their nuclear potential. In particular, garrisons are being reduced along the border with China and the withdrawal of troops from Mongolia and evacuation of facilities from Vietnam's Cam Ranh Bay are being completed.

Like Vladivostok, San Francisco was an important milestone in the restructuring of Soviet foreign policy in the Asia-Pacific sphere. There was a sensational meeting there last summer between the presidents of the USSR and South Korea. It paved the way for the complete normalization of Moscow-Seoul relations and made a breach in the iron curtain that divided the Far East during the Cold War years. Only six months later the heads of the two states signed a delcaration in the Kremlin to the effect that they "champion the ideas of turning Asia and the Pacific into a region of peace and constructive cooperation through a process of bilateral and multilateral consultations."

For many years U.S.-Soviet confrontation was the prime cause of tension in the Asia-Pacific region. But the heads of the two powers' foreign policy departments officially stated in Irkutsk that Washington and Moscow no longer regard one another as military opponents either in Europe, or in Asia. They expressed a readiness to consult with one another and to cooperate with China, Japan, Canada, India, Pakistan, and the ASEAN countries in order to contribute to the formation of processes that have a common regional perspective.

The obstacles to regional integration have finally disappeared, you might think—particularly as the thirst for it has already been realized in practice. I am referring to the Asia-Pacific economic council, which includes the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, South Korea, and also the members of ASEAN (Indonesia, Thailand, the Philippines, Malaysia, Singapore, and Brunei). Soon they will meet in Seoul to add China and its two "wayward children," Taiwan and Hong Kong, to the list. At the council's previous session in Singapore

the Australian and Canadian representatives unequivocally called for the convening of a Conference on Security and Cooperation in Asia, that is, the start of a "CSCA process" by analogy with the "CSCE process." So a prototype negotiating mechanism already exists in the region. What is preventing it from being fully activated, with the participation of all interested states?

Japan and the United States remain opposed to a collective discussion of security and cooperation problems in the Asia-Pacific region. Since it lays claim to the "northern territories," Tokyo fears anything along the lines of the Helsinki Final Act, which consolidated postwar borders. First let Moscow give up the islands, then we will be able to have a joint discussion of regional security problems—that is the essence of the Japanese stance. The idea of a Conference on Security and Cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region is also obstinately rejected by the United States, although since the official statements in Irkutsk it is more difficult for it to justify this.

Confrontation between the two superpowers in Asia, the Hong Kong weekly FAR EASTERN ECONOMIC REVIEW notes, is essentially a reflection of the situation in Europe. The vast superiority of U.S. and Japanese naval forces in the northern Pacific made sense in the context of a global strategy designed to offset the superiority of Soviet ground forces in Europe. But now that the Warsaw Pact is no longer a threat to NATO, the journal concludes, this concept is an anachronism.

Washington, however, stubbornly refuses to enter into talks with Moscow about naval armaments, saying that the United States is a naval power, whereas the USSR is a land power. (This argument, in itself groundless, prompts the question: Is it logical, then, to strive for parity with the USSR on land while seeking to preserve U.S. superiority at sea?) According to the new version, the U.S. military presence in the Asia-Pacific region will serve not so much to protect against an unlikely "Soviet threat" as to provide a counterweight to the further growth of Chinese political influence and Japanese military might. No one else can be the "stabilizer," they say, so the main elements of the U.S. Asian strategy—forward-based forces, foreign bases, bilateral military agreements—will remain.

But the course of events since the funeral of the Cold War—the arguments in Vienna and the battles on the Arabian peninsula—shows that there must be no prohibited areas and "sacred cows" in the matter of disarmament. The war in the Persian Gulf, the Japanese paper ASAHI notes, must be a lesson for the Asia-Pacific region. It reminds us of the need to reach agreement on confidence-building measures in the Asia-Pacific region, which in this respect is lagging behind Europe, and immediately embark on the creation of a security structure in the region.

So let the "Vladivostok to San Francisco" formula be put into practice. And in a double sense: both as an expanded zone of the all-European process and as the Asia-Pacific region merged with it.

## CSCE Committee Discusses Security Interests

*LD2602095691 Moscow TASS in English 1829 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna February 25 TASS—A meeting of the Consultative Committee of the Conflict-Prevention Centre was held here today. It mainly discussed various technical aspects of preparing its work. The proposal to set up this permanent institution of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) was made at the talks on confidence- and security-building measures in Europe. The Parisian summit of CSCE in November last decided to institute it in Vienna. Bent Resenthal, the head of the Danish delegation to the talks on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe, was appointed the centre's director. The centre is viewed as one of the most important organs of future European structures from the Atlantic to the Urals.

It was noted at the meeting that the setting up of the centre means real progress towards achieving an absolutely new quality of a political dialogue and cooperation in the interests of security. It reflects the striving of European countries and peoples to peaceful settlement of disputed questions fraught with conflicts and reflects the awareness of the fact that the security of every state is linked inseparably with the security of all other states.

Oleg Grinevskiy, head of the Soviet delegation to the Vienna talks, believes that the new institution of the CSCE is to undergo the stage of its establishment. How long this period of trial until practical steps in the work of the centre will take will depend on the efforts of countries participating in CSCE towards the implementation of the charter for new Europe adopted by the Paris summit. In order to advance faster it is necessary to decide what tasks that centre tackles shortly, as well as to discuss forms and methods of its activity, Grinevskiy said.

Speaking at the meeting, John Maresca, chief of the United States delegation to the negotiations on confidence- and security-building measures, said that the Gulf war can largely be instructive for the new centre. He said that the common aim of all the countries participating in the centre is to prevent such conflicts from breaking out in Europe. The U.S. representative favoured the holding of a meeting of experts from CSCE countries planned for mid- April in Vienna to exchange military information.

## Europe Institute Researcher Views CFE Treaty

*PM2702105191 Moscow IAN PRESS RELEASE in English Jan 91 pp 3-5*

[Article by USSR Academy of Sciences Europe Institute researcher Aleksandr Blinnikov: "Epilogue to the Agreement on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe"]

[Text] The Paris summit, which became a landmark event, was hardly noticed by the Soviet people. This serves to show that, contrary to expectations, the Soviet people, burdened by acute domestic problems, are still alienated from European processes.

Yet the agreement was a highly important achievement, if only because it is expected to facilitate a military reform in the Soviet Union and the restructuring of the system of military development on the basis of defence sufficiency and effectiveness, as well as on the basis of principles of socio-economic effectiveness. In this context we were bound to notice Gorbachev's report on the results of the Paris summit, delivered at the USSR Supreme Soviet. The president said that in the past few months the Soviet Union had withdrawn 20,000 tanks beyond the Urals.

This action did not cause the protest, or at least disappointment, of the West (including the NATO military quarters). However, the analysis of short-term prospects shows that the seemingly "harmless" action can have serious consequences. If the Soviet Union starts building up its armed forces outside the zone of the agreement, the West will inevitably be forced to show restraint as regards disarmament and will strive to strengthen NATO as the basis of its security. As a result, the transition from bloc structures of security to common European ones, in which the Soviet Union is clearly interested, will be threatened.

At the same time, in conditions of radical changes in the military-political situation in Europe and the acceleration of the European process (in particular the creation of non-confrontational forms of security), it will be no longer vital to maintain quantitative parity with the West in all types of conventional armaments. If the European process were a two-way street, it could allow us, by the end of the century, to go over from a military balance with lower ceilings of armaments to minimal defence sufficiency of all parties to the European process, and would create conditions precluding a return to armed confrontation for political, military and economic reasons.

This renders senseless the maintenance of strike formations in the armed forces, with tank fists as their core. The Vienna agreement destroyed the Soviet superiority over NATO in conventioal forces and deprived the Soviet Union of possibility to wage large- scale offensive operations in Europe. At the same time, the re- deployment of a large armoured formation beyond the Urals is bound to change the situation in the region.

In Western estimate, the Soviet Union had 20,000 tanks beyond the Urals (in the Southern and Far Eastern theatres). Now this figure will double. Is this an adequate reply to extra-European challenges to Soviet security, improbable in the near future? What would be the reaction of our Asian neighbours?

The efficiency of that action is highly dubitable, even if we assume that 20,000 obsolete tanks will be replaced with newer models with better combat characteristics. Besides, this action, undertaken in the interests of the military department, is increasing tensions on our overburdened economy. The transfer of 20,000 tanks strained the limited possibilities of Soviet railways to the utmost, to say nothing of the cost of their deployment.

The above shows that the problem of a military reform in the Soviet Union is more acute than ever. Further procrastination in the absence of consitutional control over the operation of the military-industrial complex threatens to undermine the fulfilment of programmes which were undertaken in the past few years within the framework of the new political thinking.

## PRAVDA Reports Protocol Winding Up Warsaw Pact

*PM2602125691 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Feb 91 Second Edition pp 1, 5*

[Report by special correspondents V. Gerasimov, A. Gorokhov: "A Time for Everything"]

[Text] Budapest, 25 Feb—A protocol on terminating the operation of military agreements within the framework of the Warsaw Pact and abolishing its military structures has been signed in Budapest.

The massive cube of the Duna Intercontinental Hotel, which is on the Danube embankment, was surrounded by police cordons: The war in the Persian Gulf requires special security measures. The foreign and defense ministers of the Warsaw Pact states who had gathered in Budapest fulfilled their governments' will today: The Warsaw Pact has "lowered its flags"—voluntarily, with the sense of a duty fulfilled.

Let us recall that for many years the military-political organization, which sprang up on the basis of objective needs, was a factor for stabilization and peace and ensured the inviolability of borders. The Warsaw Pact gave us decades of peace, and that is the main asset in the entire period of postwar development. This cannot be denied. Although it must be admitted that the strategic equilibrium of forces was sometimes achieved through a dangerous bloc confrontation, the arms race, and brinkmanship. Now that the USSR and the countries of Eastern Europe are coming out against military blocs and setting an example, they hope for understanding and support.

The abolition of the Warsaw Pact is a historic initiative. The countries of the "outgoing" bloc can say that in comparison with the NATO bloc they are ahead. The measures being adopted fit in with the events "programmed" by the very process of renewal in Europe. To achieve strategic equilibrium now by lowering the level of confrontation and arms and expanding openness and goodwill—that is today's task. The clock of history is ticking off the hours...

Some people are inclined to regard the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern Europe as a manifestation of weakness, a "retreat," and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact organization even as a "defeat." Common sense indicates otherwise: The policy of the new thinking has put down deep roots in Europe. There have been major internal changes in the Soviet Union, in all the East European countries, and in relations among them. An entirely new system of interdependence and new ideas, permeated by concern for the planet's peaceful future, is taking shape as we watch.

...It is 0900 hours. Ministers and experts have gathered in the hall of sessions. These are historic moments. We were told that the meeting has also discussed bilateral ties between the armies of the East European countries. The word "allies" will apparently not disappear from future diplomatic and military protocols. We have to work together to ensure harmonious, nonconfrontational methods in the transitional period and prevent the play of passions based on nationalist and interethnic grounds.

A bloc-free Europe—that is the shape of things to come. And it is quite clear that the formation of various regional military-political structures as alternatives to the Warsaw Pact would destabilize the strategic situation. And the new links between states that are arising in Eastern Europe and the emerging bilateral treaties should include commitments not to participate in alliances or coalitions directed against the interests of other countries in the region and not to allow the stationing of foreign forces on their territory or to make bases available to them.

Then, at noon, the document abolishing the Warsaw Pact Organization was signed. The document "went round the circle" under the lights of video cameras and flashguns. It was a friendly circle. Mutual consideration and respect for each other's interests, support for peaceful initiatives—all this remains.

Will the Budapest meeting serve as an effective and convincing appeal to the NATO countries to follow the example and embark decisively on abolishing their own military structures? Let us hope so. But the most important thing has been achieved: a victory for the new thinking, the policy of openness. Retaining the Warsaw Pact's political structures and cooperation between the East European countries and the Soviet Union and developing economic ties—that should be beneficial to everyone.

## Pact Commander Lushev Views Warsaw Pact's End

*PM2602154591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 23 Feb 91 First Edition pp 1, 2*

[Interview with Army General P.G. Lushev, USSR first deputy defense minister and Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces commander in chief, by A. Orlov; place and date not given: "We Have Our Honor; Conversation with Army General P.G. Lushev During His Preholiday Official Trip"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] [Orlov] It would be inconceivable if we did not touch on the Warsaw Pact in our conversation. You, as commander in chief of its Joint Armed Forces, have done a considerable amount to strengthen this alliance of friendly armies. But the Warsaw Pact military structures are, it seems, in their final days. What are your feelings about this?

[Lushev] We certainly should not be talking about feelings. Last year's Moscow conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee adopted a decision to transform this alliance from a military-political to a political-military alliance. In that connection a review of the tasks and functions of its military structures and their reorganization were envisaged. But today representatives of a number of alliance countries are in favor of

disbanding these structures as quickly as possible. It has already been announced that an extraordinary conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee will be held 25 February in Budapest at foreign minister and defense minister level. It is envisaged that a document on ending the validity of military agreements concluded within the Warsaw Pact framework will be signed there.

I want to note that in the 35-odd years of its existence the Warsaw Pact has made a substantial contribution to the cause of strengthening peace in Europe. It is not irrelevant to recall that all the positive processes which are going on today on the European continent are associated with it. Including the steps to create a system of collective security—it was precisely the Warsaw Pact that initiated them.

As regards the military aspect, cooperation among the Warsaw Pact states in the military sphere has enabled them to create armed forces equipped with the necessary weapons and hardware, and also to fully master modern forms and methods of conducting combat operations. Of course, each state has the right to decide questions of its security autonomously. It can be recalled that France once chose this path, leaving the NATO military organization. However, to do this it had to switch almost completely to equipping its armed forces with domestically produced weapons. Today hardly any East European state is capable of resolving these questions in this way.

And so it seems to me that the common sense argument remains. Future ties in the military sphere among East European countries must, I think, switch to the sphere of bilateral relations. Here our experience of cooperation built up in the Joint Armed Forces might prove useful. By the way, I intend to speak at the Political Consultative Committee extraordinary conference in Budapest and thank my military colleagues from the East European countries' armies for the path that we have so worthily trodden together...

[Orlov] I return again to the meetings during the trip. I spoke with all kinds of people. Including Germans, most of whom approve of both the unification of Germany and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from there. Gratitude to the USSR was invariably expressed in conversations about this. Nor were opinions in the talks divided over something else: The historical conflicts must no longer arise between the USSR and Germany. On the contrary, cooperation and a common concern for the European home are needed. And here is something else that was voiced: concern over the current presence of U.S. troops in the western part of Germany. East Germans expressed the following anxiety: Won't it turn out that the U.S. Army will want the right to deploy and have bases in the eastern laender?

"We are against a U.S. military presence, especially when Soviet soldiers are leaving for home," 50-year-old worker Klaus Hager told me. "It is time for us all to live differently..."

In fact the conversation with the first deputy defense minister continued on this point. His view was interesting: What will the world look like from the viewpoint of military-political alliances? Especially as NATO persistently talks of itself as a "stabilizing factor" and "guarantor of peace" in Europe...

[Lushev] I think that today it is appropriate to recall that the Soviet Union was opposed to the creation of military blocs right from the very beginning. The Warsaw Pact was only signed six years after NATO's formation. It was a retaliatory measure. Incidentally, Article 11 of the Warsaw Treaty indicates that it will lose its force on the day an all-European treaty on collective security is introduced. The West is also, I believe, striving toward a system of collective security. It is evident from statements by the NATO leadership and the decisions which are being adopted at its sittings that, given the situation arising in Europe, NATO has to explain the point of its future existence. Hence the thesis about being the guarantor of peace and stability on the European continent. A considerable amount is also being said about the need to preserve a "counterbalance to the USSR's military potential" and about the danger of an approaching civil war in the Union. That is the general picture. These are the pretexts under which measures aimed at improving NATO's military structures are currently going on...

Furthermore, it is no secret that the United States has always regarded Russia and the USSR as its geopolitical rival. And it is not irrelevant to remind ourselves of this when we are talking about our country's defense capability. And events in the Persian Gulf show that achieving the tasks of preserving peace today by political means alone is not, alas, always possible.

[Orlov] Petr Georgiyevich, judging by the editorial mailbag people are worried by yet another problem: How to save what has been contributed to the groups of forces?

[Lushev] We are trying to keep any material losses as small as possible. The military are no less concerned about this than the working people in our country. Everything that can be salvaged will be: Some things have been sold for foreign currency, and much is already being rescued and will be returned to the country. All this is being specially monitored. I would like to talk about one more thing. We will be judged as to how serious partner we are today according to how we observe the conditions of the treaty on the withdrawal of troops. And we must withdraw our troops from Europe as befits us, in an organized fashion. [passage omitted].

## CEMA Session Postponed, Future Assessed

*LD2602123191 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0430 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Report by "special correspondents" Viktor Levin and (Sergey Shavykin) in Budapest]

[Text] [Announcer] Continuing my description of news in international life, I want to dwell in more detail on an event that took place in Budapest. You are probably already aware, comrades, that a Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee extraordinary session took place there yesterday, at the foreign and defense minister level. A protocol was adopted unanimously and signed at the conference. The military agreements concluded within the framework of the Warsaw Pact are no longer in force, and the Warsaw Pact's military bodies and structures will be abolished on 31 march this year.

So we are in effect saying farewell to the Warsaw Pact. Incidentally, a Council for Mutual Economic Assistance session was scheduled for 27-28 February in Budapest. It has emerged that this session has been postponed. Listen to what our special correspondents in Budapest, Viktor Levin and (Sergey Shavykin) have to report.

[Levin] According to the official version expounded by Hungarian Foreign Minister Jeszenszky, the postponement is due to purely technical reasons. He said that it has not been possible to resolve all the problems relating to conference preparations in time. Frankly, I am sad to hear this news. The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, of course, is going through a stickly period, and it is all the more vital for a high-lvel meeting to settle the problems arising.

In our country at present anything and everything is frequently criticized. In principle, casting doubt on everything is a Marxist method, it is a good thing. While casting doubt on things, however, one does not have to cast everything aside as well. It is one thing to analyze and criticially evaluate, quite another to cancel things out. If one approaches the activities of CEMA in this manner, then despite all its weaknesses and shortcomings—even given that we have not managed to solve the integration problems in the way the Common Market countries, for example, have succeeded in doing—nevertheless, CEMA has done a lot that has been useful. One needs only to recall that thanks to CEMA broad economic and trading cooperation betwen all its member countries was established.

It seems to me that a very important process is under way now, not only at the economic but also the political level. Frankly speaking, yesterday was the beginning of the end of the Warsaw Pact. The decision was made to abolish its military structures. Judging by the general mood, the political structures will not last much longer either. I will not go into the reasons now. I will state just this: Our relations previously rested to a decisive degree on an ideological basis, and this predetermined the crisis in them. If one extends the economic basis, however, it will be a different matter. It is once again relevant to cite the experience of the European Community. In CEMA at present everyone is straining in a different direction, and what one gets is a Krylov fable situation where the swan, the crab, and the pike all want to pull in their own direction. The result is that things are bad for everyone. Here is a specific example.

[(Shavykin)] Bilateral relations problems remain unresolved within CEMA, nevertheless, a meeting between the two premiers, the Soviet and Hungarian, to discuss the mass of problems of bilateral economic relations, would not come amiss. After all, what do we have today? Every radio listener is very well aware what she or he lacks. But all of this, or much of it, is piled up in depots at Hungarian industrial and agricultural enterprises, just as a great deal of output the Hungarian economy requires lies rotting or rusting away in the Soviet Union.

Each partner wants not to help the needy, of course, but simply to sell these accumulated stockpiles. But they cannot. Why not? A great many reasons are cited, but all are merely to conceal one of two things: either the unwillingness or inability of the central bodies to understand the interests of their own people, let alone those of a neighboring state. Excuses are made about purely technical obstacles and the uncoordinated policy of the foreign trade department.

Even if the prime ministers fail to come to agreement we would still have a negative outcome, a recognized result of an experiment. then both we and people in Hungary would know which of the governments is most to blame for the chaos shaking the economic mechanisms both in the Soviet Union and Hungary. We would start to understand what has to be reformed first, the mechanisms or the apparatus which determine the development of our cooperation.

## CSFR Concern Over Eastern 'Threat' Reported

*LD2602173491 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Excerpts] An extraordinary conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee at the level of foreign and defense ministers of the member states was held in Budapest on 25 February. A protocol on ceasing the functioning of the military agreements concluded within the framework of the Warsaw Pact and on eliminating its military bodies and structures from 31 March was unanimously adopted and signed at the conference. A statement by the Warsaw Pact member states was also signed. Our correspondent in Czechoslovakia, Vladimir Taranov, reports:

[Taranov] [Passage omitted] Recently, there has been an increasing number of statements carried by the Czechoslovak press in which certain officials have been declaring that the main threat to the CSFR may come from its eastern neighbor, that is, from the USSR. In this regard, measures are already being taken to transfer military subunits from the western to the eastern border and to reinforce the border guard units on the Czechoslovak-Soviet border.

Leaving the Warsaw Pact organization is not a simple question for Czechoslovakia. The officers corps has received training in Soviet military educational establishments. Soviet military equipment constitutes the main bulk of the Czechoslovak armament. To pursue an

independent Czechoslovakian foreign policy and form an independent military concept, a considerable increase in defense spending is required. However, the deputies of the CSFR Federal Assembly have made it quite clear that military spending is going to be reduced in the next few years.

The majority in the Czechoslovakian Government is supporting the idea of creating a system of collective security which would guarantee Czechoslovakia a worthy place in the multinational family of the peoples of Europe.

### NATO Spokesman Cited on Organization's Future

*LD2502215291 Moscow TASS in English 2141 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Valeriy Shashkov]

[Text] Brussels February 26 TASS—The North Atlantic alliance must continue to maintain reliable defences despite the forthcoming abolition of the military bodies and structures of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation (WTO), a NATO spokesman said in comment on the decision taken in Budapest by the meeting of the WTO Political Consultative Committee.

According to the NATO spokesman, there are three main reasons for keeping NATO intact—the need for political cooperation among the 16 member countries, the maintenance of ties between the United States and Western Europe, and the existence of "numerous risks".

Even if the threat on the part of the WTO disappears, the spokesman said, there still remains the danger of instability in the Soviet Union, in Eastern Europe and in the Gulf area.

It is also essential to continue to counterbalance Soviet military might, he added. This is why at the close of the talks on disarmament, the Western allies must maintain reliable defence at lower levels of armaments, the spokesman said.

## Churkin on Soviet Interest Section in Pretoria

*LD2602150991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1355 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev, Sergey Postanogov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow 26, Feb (TASS)—Under an understanding reached with the Austrian Government, interest sections of the Soviet Union and the Republic of South Africa [RSA] are being set up in the Austrian Embassies in Pretoria and Moscow respectively.

Journalists were informed of this during an evening briefing today by Vitaliy Churkin, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate.

The idea is to maintain daily working contacts between the two countries in the absence of diplomatic and consular relations, he said. This announcement was agreed upon in Vienna on February 23-26 as a result of meetings between Vladimir Kazimirov, head of the Directorate of African countries of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Neil van Heerden, general director of the RSA Foreign Ministry.

Answering questions, Vitaliy Churkin stressed that such an understanding has become possible in light of the positive changes which have occured in South Africa during recent times—and to be precise since the start of the dismantling of apartheid and the appearance of prospects for a political resolution of the conflict in South Africa. "We consider that the establishment of interest sections in South Africa will allow us to make a more active contribution to a peace settlement in this country by cooperating with those participating in this process," the representative of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs said. Describing the policies of the USSR in relation to South Africa, the diplomat noted that they were based as before on an unreserved condemnation of apartheid and support for those forces coming out in favor of its abolition and the creation of a democratic South Africa.

Speaking about the status of the sections, Vitaliy Churkin reported that the foundations of these does not signify the establishment of diplomatic relations, they do not have the right to use national flags, coats of arms, and other state symbols. Included in the functions of the numerous Soviet employees of the section in South Africa will be the study of the situation in the country, the maintenance of working contacts with all participants in the settlement and the development of longterm relations with South Africa in various spheres.

## Northeast Asia

### Economic Talks Begin With South Korea

*LD2502135991 Moscow TASS in English 1346 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Polovko]

[Text] Moscow February 25 TASS—The Soviet-South Korean economic talks began at the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations today.

The sides are planning to determine ways of using South Korea's credit to the Soviet Union. Deputy Minister of Commerce and Industry Pak Yong-to heads the South Korean delegation.

In January, the sides reached an inter-governmental agreement that South Korea will issue a credit worth three billion U.S. dollars to the Soviet Union.

They agreed that the bank credit proper will amount to one billion dollars. One and a half billion dollars will be used to purchase consumer goods in South Korea and deliver them to the Soviet Union within three years. A total of 500 million dollars will be used to finance joint projects.

The beginning of talks has shown that they will not be easy. The Soviet side insists on reaching an immediate agreement on the range of goods and amounts of their delivery for the whole term of credit.

The South Korean delegation believes the sides should agree on the range and delivery of goods in 1991, while a trade agreement should be signed in March. There are differences on the use of investment and bank credits.

It is early to speak about the outcome of the talks yet, said Soviet First Deputy Minister of Foreign Economic Relations Aleksandr Kachanov, heading the Soviet delegation. But the side's readiness to take account of the other side's position allows to hope for finding a mutually acceptable variant, he said.

### 1990 Trade Reportedly $1 Billion

*SK2702095091 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[Text] Pak Yon-pok, vice chairman of the Korean Trade Promotion Corporation mission in Moscow, said that last year trade between the Soviet Union and the ROK increased by over 50 percent amounting to $1 billion.

According to Pak, this year will be a favorable year for economic development between the two countries.

A series of treaties that were concluded including the guarantee of investment promises this kind of development.

Pak Yon-pok reemphasized the fact that the ROK is giving a $3 billion loan to the Soviet Union.

### Sovereignty Issue 'Impeding' Ties With Japan

*PM2602084391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Feb 91 Union Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "What Is Impeding Cooperation"]

[Text] Tokyo, 22 Feb—The absence of clear separation of powers between the center and the republics in the USSR, along with the "war of sovereignties," is seriously impeding the development of Japanese-Soviet economic cooperation. That opinion is voiced today in YOMIURI SHIMBUN by Isamu Yamashita, chairman of the Japanese-Soviet Committee for Economic Cooperation.

In connection with USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev's coming visit to Japan, this prominent representative of business circles notes that the "Soviet side is insistently striving to obtain assurances from Japan on economic cooperation, mainly in the Far East, and also as regards intellectual and technical aid." "We are not averse," he indicated, "to responding to these wishes, however the biggest problem is that it is unclear whether sovereignty is vested in the Union or is switching to the republics. This will obviously become clear as a result of the national referendum in March, but at this stage we are unable to take concrete steps."

### Hokkaido Delegation Visits Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk

*PM2202135191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Feb 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Correspondent Yu. Balakirev report: "How the Islands Are Coming Together"]

[Text] An air bridge between Hokkaido and Sakhalin has been pioneered by a Douglas passenger airplane which delivered a Japanese delegation to Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk. The delegation included Hokkaido Governor Yokomichi, a large group of legislators and representatives of Japanese business circles. The guests brought with them gifts of medicines and medicaments worth 15 million yen from pharmaceutical firms in Tokyo and Osaka and also from inhabitants of Hokkaido.

At businesslike meetings in oblast center organizations talks were held about the Japanese Government's intentions to give financial aid to our country. It was reported that a large consignment of food has been bought in. In the Japanese parliament a league of friendship with Sakhalin has been established, whose members advocate distributing aid within the bounds of the Soviet Far East. The delegation showed considerable interest in the Sakhalin model of economic development, IZVESTIYA correspondent Yu. Balakirev reported.

## Near East & South Asia

### Ignatenko Discusses Iraqi Future 26 Feb

*LD2602163191 Moscow TASS in English 1547 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev, Sergey Postanogov and Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow February 26 TASS—Vitaly Ignatenko, assistant to the president of the USSR and head of the presidential press service, today began a briefing with an announcement that Mikhail Gorbachev left Moscow for Minsk, the capital of Belorussia, this morning for a several-days-long visit to Belorussia. The president is expected to tour areas affected by the Chernobyl accident and will visit Minsk, Gomel and Mogilev.

On international topics, Ignatenko drew attention to today's statement by Iraqi President Saddam Husayn that the Iraqi troop withdrawal from Kuwait will be completed on February 26. This, Ignatenko said, very seriously changes the entire situation in the region, including that from the military point of view.

In response to journalists' questions, Ignatenko emphasised that the Soviet Union supports the concept in accordance with which "Iraq would accept for fulfilment all the 12 resolutions". Whether Iraq will have time to withdraw its troops from Kuwait within one day is "its own business. At any rate, it should do its best to avoid casualties and new destruction", Ignatenko said.

In answer to a question whether peace and security in the Middle East will be guaranteed if Saddam Husayn remains in power in Iraq, Ignatenko said that the Soviet Union supports the idea of "peaceful, wealthy and prosperous Middle East, including such an important country as an "integral and unbroken" Iraq.

As to who will head this state and how its administrative structures will be formed will be decided by the Iraqi people themselves, Ignatenko said. The Soviet Union will not influence the situation in Iraq in this respect in any way, he added.

The assistant to the Soviet president voiced firm conviction that Saddam Husayn "lost the chance for peace". Ignatenko stated this in connection with a question about the Soviet president's attitude specifically to the coalition forces' ground military operations against Iraq.

"Ground operations could wait. If we were able to integrate all proposals which were expressed by both President Bush and President Gorbachev, through the institutions and instruments of the U.N. Security Council, the ground operation would not have possibly be required", Ignatenko said.

He did not rule out the possibility that the United States would resort to veto if it does not agree to a ceasefire and if the Soviet Union will insist on resolutions cancelling the use of military force against Iraq.

However, Ignatenko expressed an opinion that, whatever the outcome, the Soviet Union "will work in concert with the United States in the U.N. Security council" and will not "put any pressure". "This period in our life and diplomacy has long gone," he emphasised.

### Belonogov Comments on Post-Crisis Iraq

*LD2602160891 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1430 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[By correspondent Aleksandr Kuzin]

[Text] [Kuzin] Belonogov, USSR deputy minister of foreign affairs, spoke at today's briefing in Moscow on events in the Persian Gulf. He told journalists that Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq 'Aziz went to the Soviet Embassy in Baghdad last night and handed over a message from Saddam Husayn concerning the decision by the Iraqi leadership to immediately withdraw its troops from Kuwait, in accordance with Security Council Resolution 660. It was pointed out in the message that the order for the withdrawal of troops had already been given, the withdrawal had already begun, and that it would be carried out within a very short period of time. Belonogov continued:

[Begin recording] We proceed from the fact that this new step by the Iraqi leadership will satisfy all sides. I want to tell you that we immediately, as soon as it became known in Moscow that a message from Saddam Husayn had been received, officially informed the United States that Iraq had begun to carry out Security Council Resolution 660. At the same time we gave instructions to the USSR representative at the United Nations to propose the urgent convocation of the Security Council so that it might resolve the ceasefire issue without delay. [end recording]

[Kuzin] Responding to a question about the first reaction of the United States in relation to the fact that the Iraqi statement did not fully meet the resolutions of the Security Council, Belonogov declared that Iraq's position is now completely clear. It is not putting forward any conditions, and the Soviet Union does not see any defects in Baghdad's official position which would give grounds for drawing out the ceasefire.

Belonogov noted in answers to questions that he did not know whether a telephone conversation had taken place between President Gorbachev and President Bush last night. He also stressed that, although military means of resolving a conflict might sometimes sharply accelerate the course of events, this must be paid for in human lives. In connection with this, the Soviet Union had placed the main emphasis on the opportunities opened up by diplomacy.

Elucidating the USSR's position in relation to Iraq's future, the executive of our country's foreign policy department stated that the Soviet Union is coming out in favor of Iraq maintaining its territorial integrity and occupying a worthy place in its region in the post-crisis

period as well. We want to see Iraq as a strong, peaceable and flourishing state, he stressed. As far as the position of the Soviet Union when the crisis in this region ends is concerned, Belonogov noted that it is now hard to judge what the situation in this country is, the degree of destruction there. When the situation becomes clearer then all members of the world community must resolve the issue of what contribution they should they should make to the restoration of the region and the restoration of Iraq.

## Reports View Ground Offensive, Peace Efforts

### U.S. Stand 'Hardening'

*PM2602164491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Feb 91 First Edition p 6*

[Correspondent V. Gan report: "The Pressure Continues"]

[Text] Washington, 26 Feb—Today the White House rejected in tough and rather stubborn terms the possibility of a cease-fire in response to the Baghdad radio announcement on the withdrawal of all Iraqi troops from Kuwait.

After President Bush's evening meeting with his leading national security advisers, White House Press Secretary M. Fitzwater read a statement saying that the United States "is continuing the war," seeing no reason to abandon it.

"We do not know," he said, "whether the latest claim about Iraq's departure is sincere. We have no evidence that the Iraqi Army is leaving. Furthermore, Iraqi subunits are continuing combat operations." Fitzwater drew attention to the point in the Baghdad radio report which stated that Iraqi troops will use weapons while retreating. "We will not attack unarmed retreating soldiers. But we will regard the departure of armed subunits as a hostile act." He explained that the United States demands that the Iraqis lay down their arms.

Observers assessed the White House response as a hardening of Washington's position. It was noted here that the White House has added, in particular, the demand for a public declaration by [Saddam] Husayn of consent to all UN resolutions. The administration does not consider that Iraq has put forward any proposal, and does not recognize Baghdad Radio as an official spokesman for Husayn.

It seems that the mood reflected in the statement, a mood of rejection of any peaceful gesture by Iraq, can be explained not only in terms of the success of the coalition's land operations, but mainly in terms of Washington's determination to achieve its own military-political aims before talking about peace. These aims are well known, and, among other things, include undermining the Iraqi military potential to the maximum possible degree, and removing Husayn. As ABC television noted, according to U.S. officials even if Iraq were to decide to leave Kuwait unconditionally, the United States would still not agree to a cease-fire. While continuing the hostilities, it could merely begin to discuss a cease-fire.

Judging by officials' remarks, they generally "see no place" for Husayn in the Near East. As ABC also reported, "in the administration's view Husayn should be publicly humiliated in such a way that he cannot become a kind of political colossus in the Arab world." Such sentiments are also widespread on Capitol Hill, where President Bush is constantly being called on to seek Husayn's removal from power. One possible way of achieving this that is being spoken of is the partial occupation of Iraqi territory and the maintenance of economic sanctions as levers to bring pressure to bear on the Baghdad regime. Voices warning of the danger of overstepping the bounds of the UN resolution are, as a rule, barely audible.

### Iraqi 'Staunchness,' 'Valor' Lauded

*PM2702113791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 27 Feb 91 First Edition p 5*

[Special correspondent Viktor Filatov report: "The Bloodshedders"]

[Text] Baghdad—The start of the ground battles meant the start of war on Iraqi territory. The Iraqi Army is now in contact with the enemy on the ground. Iraq's destiny is now in its soldiers' hands.

Back in the past I spent time in Korea and Vietnam. I saw what the Americans did there with their B-52's and their napalm, with their chemical and bacteriological weapons. Here I am now, inside fighting Iraq. I see what the Americans are doing now. And I can assert this: Nothing has changed in the U.S. GI's ways of thinking and acting since the ravage of Korea and Vietnam—the selfsame barbaric bombing raids, with the only difference that now they are more treacherous and more sophisticated. The B-52's of notorious fame have been moved over here. The only difference being that now they are loaded not with bombs but with cruise missiles, which are smarter than bombs. Primarily they kill people.

Baghdad—a healthy and flourishing organism—has now had its liver and kidneys cut off, its eyes gouged out, and its ear drums punctured. In other words, Baghdad is without electricity or water. Neither radio, nor television, nor refrigerators are working... The Americans are trying to drive the Iraqis, just like they did with the Vietnamese in the past, into the Stone Age.

Last night they simply went mad. Bombing raids went on continuously. The capital spent the night amidst the sounds of howling sirens, the roar of explosions, fire alarms, and tracer bullets and shells. Smoke now covers the sky above Baghdad, just as it did above our own Moscow when the peatbogs around it were on fire.

I do not know what more there is to bomb here—everything has been destroyed, damaged, or razed to the ground. How much more blood do these 20th century barbarians want now. "The 20th Century Barbarians"—that was the title of one of my past reports from Saigon. Recently I thought that I would never again have an occasion to write such words. I thought that, following the last rapacious war, the Americans had changed. But no! They never change. They remain true to their own selves.

The Americans' bombing raids have, to all intents and purposes, brought the Iraqis face to face with a terrifying prospect, which is actually looming. Temperatures will soon reach and exceed 50 degrees [Centigrade]. There might an outburst of epidemics in such heat. What if such epidemics are actually provoked? There are such specialists in the States. Afterwards everything can be attributed to lack of sanitation and poor medical standards.

When the Americans and their allies burst into the attack against Iraq 24 February, the entire Western press, television, and radio starting screaming about victory and the plans according to which the U.S. offensive was supposedly developing. There were outcries about claims that the Americans had taken hundreds of Iraqis prisoner and that this was already posing a problem—lack of food and drink for them. But the Iraqis also have prisoners. They also pose problems. It was only yesterday that people in Baghdad seized a U.S. airman from an aircraft that was shot down: The authorities just about managed to save him from the people's anger.

I have learned from reliable sources that the allies' offensive has gotten bogged down. Even if the five advancing columns claimed by the Americans did exist, they are not advancing but marking time on Saudi Arabia's territory. Those who have succeeded in getting out of the trenches and advancing, have had to halt. They were halted by infantry unit soldiers—the Republican Guard has yet to join the battle.

The Americans have announced the capture of Faylakah Island. The Iraqis immediately offered to Western television crews in Baghdad to take them to that island so that they could see for themselves in whose hands it is. The report about the island's capture was immediately refuted.

Today the Iraqis intercepted a Western [radio] station reporting that Russian language could be heard in the airwaves in the battle zone, claiming that the Russians are in charge there. This provocation's purpose is obvious: If the Americans gain victory, it would be a victory over the Russians.

Today we visited the Iraqi Foreign Ministry. I saw animated faces. People were discussing the latest events. This is not to be expected in the Foreign Ministry of a country on the brink of disaster.

We then had a conversation with Deputy Foreign Minister Sa'd al-Faysal. He took part in all the latest talks in Moscow. Now he expressed complete satisfaction with the meeting with M.S. Gorbachev and approval for the Soviet peace initiatives. By rejecting these initiatives, the United States has fully revealed itself as a country which rejects the peaceful ways for settling the conflict.

Here are the latest reports from the front. Iraqi troops continue the fierce battles against the enemy. The Iraqi fighters have steadfastly withstood the initial powerful strike, held firm, and, in their own turn, moved on the counteroffensive using units and subunits of III Corps headed by General Salah 'Abbud. The counteroffensive continued all along the front for eight hours without interruption. The Iraqi Army has proved its staunchness, fortitude, and valor.

## U.S. Urged to Show 'Benevolence'

*LD2702145291 Moscow TASS in English 1438 GMT 27 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Postanogov]

[Text] Moscow February 27 TASS—The decision on the unconditional and immediate withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait, announced by the Iraqi leadership, has created a fundamentally new situation in the Gulf, which could be described as yet another chance for a peaceful settlement of the crisis.

In order to utilise the real opportunity to interrupt the military phase of the conflict and move to a political settlement, the Soviet Union on Tuesday urged the countries involved in the multi-national anti-Iraq forces to cease fire.

However, despite the fact that Iraqi troops have started to withdraw from Kuwait, military operations continue. People continue to die on both sides of the conflict. A real chance for immediate cessation of the bloodshed was lost.

Analysing the latest developments over the past few hours, one can say that the Iraqi Army is suffering a defeat under the powerful blows of the multinational forces.

However, the question arises: Is it worthwhile sacrificing human lives in order to destroy the Iraqi military machine? Kuwait has been practically liberated and, consequently, the reason for the military operations has been removed.

The termination of the armed confrontation and a settlement of the problem at the negotiating table could be a logical way out of the current situation, one that would meet the interests of the entire international community.

It is precisely this position that the Soviet Union adheres to, aware of the need to stop the bloodshed immediately

and restore peace and stability in the Gulf, with due regard for the interests of all countries in the region.

This is why the Soviet Union urged the parties involved in the conflict to show reason and benevolence and move from armed confrontation to a political settlement.

### Saddam Withdrawal Statement Viewed

*PM2702150191 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 27 Feb 91 p 3*

[Report by correspondent A. Shumilin: "Double Time, March out of Kuwait!"]

[Text] Algiers—Over the occupied capital of Kuwait that state's national flag has again been raised. Saving themselves from the oncoming allies, the Iraqi soldiers are fleeing the city, leaving their military equipment, weapons, and even their uniforms on the streets.

S. Husayn has stated that he has given the order for his troops' withdrawal from Kuwait. The U.S. military specialists think otherwise: The Iraqis are simply fleeing under the onslaught of the multinational forces.

For seven months the world has been waiting for the rulers of Baghdad to renounce the occupation of Kuwait. That happened yesterday morning. In his latest radio broadcast to the Iraqis Saddam Husayn said very simply: "The time has come to return Kuwait to its original (!) government." Not lawful, let us note, but original.

Thus the long-awaited answer to the most important issue of the crisis has been given. What forced the dictator to embark on that step now?

During the second day of the allies' ground offensive, there was no serious resistance from the Iraqi units. The Republican Guard's attempts at a tank attack led to the complete defeat of the group while it was still approaching the allied troops. The number of Iraqi prisoners of war has exceeded the 20,000 mark and has created considerable problems for the allies in transporting and providing for them. The capital of Kuwait is surrounded and blockaded. In general, it is already possible to speak of the Iraqi troops' defeat in the Kuwait zone. An unexpectedly swift defeat, without large-scale fighting, as had previously been expected.

But individual local clashes between the allies and the republican guard are, alas, inevitable for the time being. No one now, even Saddam Husayn himself, has any doubt as to their outcome. Hence the Iraqi president's insight, hence the haste with the belated initiative rejected by him only three days ago: Even a partial defeat of the republican guard means not only Iraq's definitive military defeat but also the weakening of the domestic political support for Husayn's regime.

That is why on the night of Monday to Tuesday the Iraqi ambassador to the United Nations stated the readiness to withdraw the troops from Kuwait and even Saddam Husayn's order to begin this withdrawal. That is why on that same night Iraqi Foreign Minister Tariq 'Aziz visited the Soviet Embassy in Baghdad and handed a message from Husayn to Mikhail Gorbachev. Hence the urgent convening of the UN Security Council and the speech delivered at it by the Soviet representative with the suggestion for a cease-fire for the Iraqi troops' withdrawal from Kuwait.

As expected, the reaction of the coalition countries to Saddam Husayn's initiative was slightly more restrained and cautious: After all, there has been a lot of talk about Baghdad's readiness to withdraw its troops but it has nonetheless remained talk. It looks as though the United States, Britain, and France in this situation have toughened their stance and are demanding that Baghdad recognize the whole package of UN resolutions on Kuwait and also that it fulfill the next condition: The withdrawal of the Iraqi troops can be implemented only on condition that the Iraqis leave their military equipment and weapons on the spot.

It is not hard to understand this unanimous stance of the allies: The withdrawal of the Iraqi troops from Kuwait should become the prelude to peace and therefore it is essential to rule out the likelihood of the withdrawn troops regrouping on Iraqi territory and delivering a concentrated strike against the allies from the North. In brief, not only equipment and heavy armaments but also firearms should be left on the spot by the Iraqis. On the diplomatic plane the allies are insisting that Saddam Husayn personally recognize all UN resolutions on Kuwait, including those which provide for Iraqi compensation to the emirate for the damage caused to it. In other words, it is already a case of Baghdad's capitulation and not of "an honorable withdrawal of troops" and of "face-saving." Yet Saddam Husayn could have avoided this finale last week by accepting the Soviet proposals and beginning the withdrawal of his troops then.

### Peace Plan Gaining 'Second Wind'

*LD2602171691 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Today, we are constantly talking about the latest developments in the Persian Gulf crisis. The latest report states that Iraqi troops have left the capital of Kuwait, Kuwait City: This was reported today by an official representative of the Kuwaiti military command. Here we have in our studio political observer Igor Sergeyevich Fesunenko. Igor Sergeyevich, let us talk about what this report was preceded by, and what may follow in the development of events.

[Fesunenko] Yes of course, without any exaggeration today can be called a dramatic one. [passage omitted]

[Announcer] What now?

[Fesunenko] I would say that some kind of a stalemate situation has formed. Iraq is withdrawing from Kuwait. Moreover, Saddam Husayn has promised to complete

the withdrawal by the this evening, that is, Tuesday, while the United States is acting as if nothing is happening. There are no official statements on this matter from the top representatives of the administration or from President Bush himself. Meanwhile, U.S. troops are pursuing Iraqi troops, who are on their way out of Kuwait. As you have correctly reported, a report has just arrived that Kuwait City has already been liberated. But the offensive continues. This may lead to a tragedy. You understand, when there is no decision about a cease-fire, and the withdrawal of troops is taking place, a large-scale shooting in the back may start. You asked me, what next, what may happen after this.

[Announcer] Yes, a forecast please.

[Fesunenko] From the U.S. point of view, we have yesterday's statement by President Bush, which was made before Iraq's declaration of a withdrawal from Kuwait. Bush said: We are going to liberate Kuwait. At the same time, the United States, so to speak, is not going to lay down its arms, both in the direct and in the figurative sense. Of course, the Americans want to keep their positions there. Moreover, according to a statement by a Pentagon representative, the Americans would like to seize the southeastern part of Iraq, which has strategic significance, and to hold it for some time as a trump card at the peace talks, which would apparently start in the near future, to have a lever of pressure on Saddam Husayn. This is the future from the point of view of Washington, while from our point of view, it is time to recall our peace initiative, put forward...

[Announcer, interrupting] The Gorbachev plan, you mean?

[Fesunenko] Yes, known to the whole world as the Gorbachev plan. I think that these latest events today, the events of the last hours, and what is happening now, at this minute, shows that the plan was actually correct in principle, and that it should not have been brushed aside from the outset, the way Washington did. Now this plan is, so to speak, gaining its second wind, and I think that our leadership will insist on the implementation of a whole number of positive proposals that are contained in it. That is, our chief aim is peace, the prevention of bloodshed, and the possibility to give the peoples of both Iraq and Kuwait, as well as other peoples of this region, a chance to decide their fate for themselves, including, of course, the resolution of the Palestinian issue. [passage omitted]

### U.S. Said To Want Control of Oil

*PM2702111991 Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 26 Feb 91 p 3*

[IAN report: "Who Will Benefit?"]

[Text] If, as a result of victory, the Americans succeed in establishing control over half the Iraqi and Kuwaiti oil fields—which contain 200 billion barrels of oil reserves—then, at a price of $30 dollars a barrel, the U.S. profit could be $3 trillion. This sum is 100 times greater than Washington's predicted spending on the Gulf War.

Informed USSR Defense Ministry circles believe that the United States is not planning to limit itself to the liberation of Kuwait. Its main aim is to seize oil-rich southern Iraq. This will allow the United States to get its hands on the world oil faucet and dole out oil supplies to West Europe and Japan in line with its own political and economic interests.

The presence of U.S. troops in Saudi Arabia gives Washington a huge geopolitical advantage. If the United States manages to gain control of the Arabian oil too, it will have its hands on 45 percent of world oil stocks.

In the event of the Iraqi command blowing up the oil wells in Kuwait and Iraq, oil supplies around the world will drop by 3-5 million barrels a day. This will boost the oil price to $65-100 a barrel. In such an event the energy crisis would be far more serious than the crisis of the seventies. But the United States would suffer least. Japan would suffer most.

### Official Views Gulf Peace Efforts

*PM2702145091 London ITV Television Network in English 1900 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Interview with government spokesman Sergey Grigoriyev in Moscow by correspondent Jon Snow on 26 February; from the Channel 4 News program—recorded]

[Text] [Snow] On the line to Moscow, I've been talking to Sergey Grigoriyev, a spokesman for President Gorbachev. I asked him if the Soviet Union was now resigned to seeing the allies pursuing the military solution.

[Grigoriyev] The Soviet Union is not giving up in its efforts for peace. If there is a chance to find a peaceful solution, if there is a chance to save human lives, if there is a chance to see to it that there will be less damage done by this war, the Soviet Union is still prepared to negotiate, to be a peacemaker and to try to put everyone around the table for negotiations. If it doesn't work, it doesn't work, and we'll feel sorry about it. Basically, we should be very happy if all the resolutions of the UN Security Council will be put into life.

[Snow] Does the Soviet Union tonight, Mr. Grigoriyev, feel that there can be peace and security in the region now and in and around Kuwait so long as Saddam Husayn remains in power in Baghdad?

[Grigoriyev] Well, I don't think it's actually a matter of our desire or not whether Saddam Husayn is there. It is the domestic affair of the Iraqis, whether they want Saddam Husayn to be their leader in Baghdad or not. What the main concern for the coalition and for all those partners who actually adopted all these UN Security Council resolutions is the following: that Kuwait's independence has to be restored, that Iraq is withdrawing unconditionally from Kuwait, and that we can actually

see to it that we can work out a plan for a peaceful solution for the Gulf, a plan for the structure that will really enhance security of all the nations big and small, of all the nations in the Gulf area.

[Snow] Although you support the view that Saddam Husayn wants his forces to withdraw unconditionally, he still is not satisfying key elements of the United Nations resolutions, as the United States has been pointing out. For example, renouncing all claim to Kuwait and talking of reparation for the damage done.

[Grigoriyev] What we are saying now is that we are giving a chance for peace. If there is a chance for peace that can actually stop the escalation of the war, that can save more human lives and so on, I think it's very important. I think all the other things are negotiable. I think the Iraqis are now facing a very monolithic coalition that was adopting the UN Security Council resolutions and that wants to see to it that these resolutions have to be put into life. Now, if the Iraqis withdraw, it will be quite possible to negotiate with them and to make sure that all the demands of the Security Council resolutions will be put into life. Of course it will take time, of course it's not a fast solution: It's a protracted solution. But since we think that it's a bloodless solution, it probably stands a much better chance.

## Kuwaiti Envoy on 'Firm Basis' of Soviet Ties

*PM2602171191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Feb 91 Union Edition p 4*

[Interview with Kuwaiti Ambassador to the USSR 'Abd-al-Muhsen Yusuf al-Du'ayj "on the (25 February) 30th Anniversary of his state" by A. Ostalskiy—place not stated: "Kuwait Will Be Free"]

[Text] [Ostalskiy] Mr. Ambassador, allow me first of all to congratulate you on the anniversary, especially in view of the fact that it is a round date. Probably it is a very strange feeling—to celebrate this date at the very time that on the territory of your motherland a bitter battle for its freedom is underway...

[Al-Du'ayj] Yes, we are experiencing mixed feelings: both grief and joy. Grief because the country lies in ruins, and joy because the liberation has begun. This morning I (and other Kuwaitis too, I think) awoke in a quite different mood, a more buoyant mood, than on any day in the last six months. So that even in the future this day—25 February—will always evoke bright memories for us: both as the national day and as the day that the liberation of our country began.

[Ostalskiy] Are you receiving news from Kuwait? How is the fighting going? Has the Kuwait City itself been liberated yet?

[Al-Du'ayj] Yes, we are receiving news: The opposition movement possesses radiotelephone equipment which provides our government with a satellite link to it. According to the latest information the city has not yet been liberated but our troops, together with U.S. Marines and paratroops, have consolidated their hold on the outskirts and—this is of particular importance—have established direct contact with the opposition movement. Thanks to it they now know precisely the positions of the Iraqi troops and command centers. In the coming hours they will be dealt a crushing blow.

[Ostalskiy] What is the situation in the country according to the latest information?

[Al-Du'ayj] The situation is extremely serious. Yesterday the Iraqis blew up the parliament building and the Sheraton, Plaza, Meridian, and Marriott Hotels—all in the very center of the city. Three days ago, after Friday prayers, which have, as you know, a special significance for Muslims, Iraqi troops began to seize youths (from 13 years upward) as they came out of the mosques, put them onto trucks, and take them away somewhere. We do not know where, and we are extremely worried about their fate; after all, this is very much like what the Nazis did before retreating, killing civilians and destroying all the witnesses to their crimes. Since the beginning of the war alone, according to our information, 40,000 inhabitants of Kuwait have already been arrested, and we do not know how many of them have managed to stay alive. Understand, I am not exaggerating; we do not need exaggerations; there is not very long to wait before the world will see for itself what the occupiers have done in Kuwait, and I think that the world will be horrified. I am continuously racked by the question: Why, what for? We had done nothing bad to Iraq; on the contrary, we had helped them. Whence this bestial hatred and fury to destroy a whole country?

[Ostalskiy] Mr. Ambassador, but surely it was possible to have postponed the allied forces' attack just a little longer; perhaps this would have given one more chance for a peaceful, diplomatic settlement which might have enabled further bloodshed and still greater destruction of your country to be avoided?

[Al-Du'ayj] The Iraqis have already been burning the oil wells for several days; around 200 of them are engulfed in flames. In other words an attempt is being made to destroy Kuwait's national wealth. These irreplaceable losses would have grown with every new day of delay. At the same time, both the acts of arson and the new waves of mass arrests began at a time when the Iraqi leadership was hypocritically conducting negotiations for the withdrawal of its troops from Kuwait. How can we believe in its sincerity? Moreover, Iraqi official figures are still refusing even to pronounce the word "Kuwait" and are refusing to recognize our independence and national sovereignty. They agreed to withdraw their troops to the positions which they occupied 1 August last year—that is to say in a position of heightened combat readiness on the Kuwaiti border! As far as we understand it Iraq, in giving its agreement to the withdrawal of its troops from "its 19th province," linked this agreement to a number of conditions. Including the rescinding of reparations for the damage caused to our country stipulated by the UN

Security Council resolution! And this at a time when the stores in Baghdad are still crammed with computers, electronic goods, domestic appliances, clothing, and so forth carried off from the plunder of Kuwait. Valuables have been sent to Iraq as well as all the books from the National Library, airplanes belonging to the Kuwaiti airline, the medical equipment of almost all the hospitals, and much, much else. Baghdad is demanding the repeal of all Security Council resolutions which declare the annexation of Kuwait unlawful. Of course we, and, I hope, the United Nations, could not agree to such a formulation of the question.

We do not doubt the sincerity of the Soviet Union's intentions, and we thank it for its support and help in preserving the independence and sovereignty of Kuwait. The peace plan put forward by Moscow brought no results because of Saddam Husayn's position: We cannot believe in his sincerity at all. But our relations with the USSR cannot be complicated because of this; they have a very firm basis. I am convinced that these relations have a magnificent future. The Soviet Union of perestroyka—the Soviet Union of Gorbachev—is a brilliant partner not only for us, but for all the Arab states of the Persian Gulf.

### Soviet Destroyer Arrives in Alexandria, Egypt

*LD2202232291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1512 GMT 22 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Krutikhin]

[Text] Alexandria, 22 Feb (TASS)—The destroyer "Bezuprechnyy", under the flag of the squadron's commander Rear Admiral P.G. Svyatashov, moored in Alexandria port today. This is the first visit by a Soviet Navy vessel to an Egyptian port since 1973.

Representatives of the command of Alexandria's naval base, who visited the ship, welcomed the Soviet guests and expressed confidence that the ties between the two countries' Navies, which have a long history, will develop and grow stronger.

### Afghan Rebels Said Holding 100 Soviet Servicemen

*LD2402212991 Moscow TASS in English 2050 GMT 24 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Aleksandrov]

[Text] Kabul February 24 TASS—About 100 Soviet servicemen captured by Afghan rebels at different times are alive and held in rebel groups in different parts of Afghanistan and Pakistan. Thirty-five of them are permanently held on Afghan territory, others are in Pakistan or move to and fro with armed rebel groups. Soviet journalists were told today by secretary of the Afghan Inter-Departmental Commission for the Search and Release of Prisoners of War held by rebels Zakhir Sattar.

This commission was set up in accordance with the Afghan Government decision in the middle of 1988. Its members represent the republic's Defence, Interior and State Security Ministries.

Last year, the commission, which operated in conjunction with the Soviet Embassy in Kabul, helped four Soviet prisoners of war return home. Now it is busy seeking how to get rebels release some other prisoners. The commission has also located 6,077 Afghan prisoners of war and arranged the release of 987.

Commission members have conducted painstaking work to identify the names and location of 18 Soviet servicemen held by rebels. Most of them are held in out-of-the-way villages, some have assumed Moslem names and have families and children and follow local lifestyles, differing little from Afghan people.

There are no prisoners in the direct sense of the word among them: They are not kept behind bars or in custody. Most of them are relatively free to move about and live in houses provided for them, although a degree of supervision and control is exercised over their lives.

It is very difficult to establish contacts with these people and talk them into returning home. In the atmosphere of hostilities continuing in Afghanistan, soldiers often regard with distrust those who propose that they return to the Soviet Union. In these circumstances even letters from the Soviet Embassy containing the Soviet parliament's decree on amnesty for servicemen captured by rebels in Afghanistan and the proposal to return do not always help. Then, letter from their parents or tape recordings of the voices of their mothers and fathers are conveyed to former Soviet servicemen.

The problem of Soviet war prisoners has become considerably politicized of late. Rebel leaders, aware of the great interest shown by the Soviet Union in the release of its citizens, put forth political demands, up to calling for an end to Soviet assistance to the Afghan Republic in exchange for Soviet prisoners of war.

All this makes the commission's work extremely difficult, especially since the commission regards the POW problem as purely humanitarian one.

The question of Soviet servicemen's burials in Afghan territory was not raised until recently. Such burials exist and intense work is necessary to locate them and transport the remains to the Soviet Union. There is no single coordinating body in the Soviet Union, dealing with the problem of prisoners of war and burials of Soviet servicemen in Afghanistan.

### Diplomat Comments on Relations With Afghanistan

*LD2502135691 Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Aleksandrov]

[Text] Moscow February 25 TASS—"This treaty had turned a new page in the history of relations between our two countries and strengthened the principles of friendship, equitable cooperation and good-neighbourly relations on which they are based," Soviet ambassador at large Nikolay Kozyrev, dealing with problems of settling the Afghan issue, told TASS on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the first treaty concluded between Soviet Russia and Afghanistan.

"Unfortunately, we failed to avoid mistakes during this period. Some of them were made by us. They include the sending of Soviet troops into Afghanistan in December 1979," he added. "We tried to help Afghanistan, as we did it before, but the chosen form of assistance was incorrect," Kozyrev noted.

Asked about the continuing Soviet assistance to Afghanistan, the ambassador said it was the USSR's moral and humane duty, the duty "of a neighbouring nation to render such assistance," because we are indebted to Afghanistan for causing, willingly or unwillingly, the death of thousands of Afghans. This could have been avoided, if the mentioned mistake was not committed, and today we have to pay for it, in spite of the difficult domestic situation in our own country," Kozyrev stressed.

"The military aid to Kabul," he said, "is intended not to continue the war, but, paradoxical though it may seem, to achieve a political settlement in Afghanistan, which is accelerated by arms deliveries.

"The opposition respects strength and, seeing that its attempts to settle the problem by military means are futile, it will have to agree to compromises and peaceful negotiations," the diplomat said.

Moreover, he believes a unilateral discontinuation of arms deliveries to Kabul would help install an extremist regime in Afghanistan, which would pose a real threat to stability in Soviet Central Asia.

Turning to the problem of Soviet war prisoners, captured by the armed opposition, Kozyrev expressed the view that it could be fully settled through a political settlement of the Afghan issue as a whole. At the same time, he stressed that active efforts to release Soviet war prisoners are not being stopped for a single moment and were being "exerted in every possible direction".

## Reports Mark 2d Afghan Withdrawal Anniversary

### Political Situation Assessed

*91UF0494A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian*
*15 Feb 91 Second Edition p 4*

[Article by V. Semenov: "Two Years Since"]

[Text] Two years have elapsed since the day when the withdrawal from Afghanistan of the Soviet 40th Army was completed.

The two years of "independent defense of the homeland," as the period since the withdrawal of Soviet forces is officially called in Afghanistan, have shown that the forces that came to power 13 years ago are not as weak and few as their enemies have attempted to portray them. Whereas an ever increasing number of Afghan refugees constituting the principal source of replenishment of the opposition formations is, despite the obstacles being put in their way by the Pakistani authorities, returning home, and the number of supporters of national reconciliation is growing.

Nonetheless, blood continues to be spilled on Afghan soil. Kabul and other cities are being subjected to concentrated rocket attacks which make no sense from the military viewpoint. The civilian population—women, old men, children—are dying.

Afghan society is split—this is its tragedy. On the one hand, those who support the country's right to choose new paths of social and political development and an end to the war by way of the achievement of national reconciliation. This means the Fatherland Party, which has a membership of approximately 200,000, and a number of other parties united in the Peace Front, the country's armed forces, the majority of the intelligentsia, and a growing working class. On the other, those who desire the establishment in the country of an Islamic clerical-political power system or a return to the bourgeois-feudal past. They reject national reconciliation and are prepared to fight until "total victory." These forces are headed by the major landowners, who have fled abroad, religious figures adhering to positions of Islamic fundamentalism and a variety of declasse elements and political adventurers pursuing their own ends under the "defense of Islam" slogan.

President Najibullah proposes that Afghanistan preserve its status of sovereign, territorially integral, independent, and nonaligned Islamic state maintaining normal friendly relations with all states, primarily with its neighbors. The way to end the bloodshed lies via the establishment of an intra-Afghan dialogue and free democratic elections under the aegis of the United Nations and with its most active participation, on the basis of whose results a government should be formed. Najibullah has confirmed that "for the sake of the establishment of peace in the country he is prepared to sacrifice his personal interests." It is essential, as priority practical steps, to negotiate so-called "symmetry"—a halt to arms supplies to the Afghan belligerents from all sources with a simultaneous cease-fire.

Pakistan, as a direct subscriber, and the United States, as a guarantor, of the Geneva accords are ignoring the commitments concerning noninterference and a renunciation of intervention. The only thing of interest to them in these agreements was the Soviet Union's undertaking to withdraw its forces from Afghanistan. While declaring from time to time their devotion to a political settlement, they have in fact, evidently, not lost hope of a military solution, as a result of which the forces that

they support would come to power in Kabul. Islamabad maintains that it aspires to the development of friendly, good-neighborly relations with the Soviet Union, but M.N. Sharif, prime minister of Pakistan, declares that his government will continue to render the Afghan mujahidin the utmost support. Islamabad would obviously like to remove the Afghan conflict from the framework of Pakistani-Soviet relations, without regard for our country's entire involvement therein and our traditionally extensive relations with our southern neighbors.

Thompson, special U.S. representative attached to the so-called "transitional government," stated in an interview with Voice of America the invariability of Washington's implacable attitude toward the Republic of Afghanistan and assured the mujahidin that the United States would, as before, render them assistance as long as "the Afghan people cannot realize their right to self-determination." The U.S. Congress has approved subsidies to the "intransigents" for 1991 of more than $280 million, which is somewhat less than in previous years. But the overall amount of aid in the current year could constitute $900 million.

Influential U.S. circles are in no hurry to play a positive part in a settlement of the Afghan problem. There is evidence of attempts to continue that same policy of "exhaustion" of the Soviet Union and the calculation that internal socioeconomic problems and interethnic conflicts will force it to curtail its assistance to Afghanistan.

Inspired by the United States and Pakistan, the "intransigents" are rejecting out of hand, so to speak, all of the Afghan president's proposals concerning political methods of a settlement.

If we take an impartial view, it is clear that Najibullah has gone not half-way but the majority of the way toward peace in Afghanistan and has approached the line that separates a peaceful, political settlement, a fair compromise, if you will, from unconditional surrender.

There arises the reasonable question: Why are the "intransigents" declining the organization of free democratic elections under international supervision, which would immediately make clear the question of "who's who" in Afghanistan? Do they not claim to control 90 percent of the territory of the country, whose people "long to be rid of the hated regime?" Because, perhaps, they are not at all sure of an outcome of such elections favorable to themselves? Or because, perhaps, the leaders of the "intransigents" themselves, while constantly complaining about the lack of unity in their ranks, are engaged in a desperate fratricidal struggle that at times develops into ruthless mutual annihilation?

Western observers well acquainted with the morals and customs of the "Peshawar tricksters" are convinced that, were they to come to power in Kabul, rivers of blood would flow. It is not fortuitous, evidently, that neither the United States nor Pakistan has yet officially recognized the "mujahidin government."

Sensing their incapacity for either taking power or managing it, the leaders of the opposition are attempting to shift the blame onto the Soviet Union and to get from Moscow and Kabul by moral and political blackmail what they have not succeeded in getting throughout the past 13 years. The clearest confirmation of this is the problem, extremely painful for Soviet people, of the release of Soviet POW's in the hands of the "intransigents," who refuse to recognize its humanitarian nature and who are playing with people's lives to achieve political ends.

It has to be mentioned also that certain outside forces would like to benefit from the situation taking shape in the Soviet Union. In connection with the Afghan conflict these forces are now gambling on the so-called "Islamic factor." It is no secret that calls are heard from time to time from the camp of the Peshawar chiefs for the spread of the jihad that is dying in Afghanistan to the Soviet Central Asian republics. Armed Afghan opposition gangs have already attempted rocket attacks on the Soviet border area, the creation of their agents there, the dispatch of narcotics and weapons and propaganda of anti-Soviet literature.

For centuries Afghanistan has traditionally occupied a prominent place in Russia's foreign policy. The continuing conflict is forcing us to render this neighboring country considerable economic and military-technical aid. We cannot, however difficult it is for us, terminate this aid—both because of contractual obligations and because of our moral duty to this country and its people. This would jeopardize the life and fate of hundreds of thousands, perhaps millions, of Afghanis who for many years have not under the influence of some ideology but simply in a human fashion believed in us. The curtailment of aid would have unpredictable consequences for our country's national interests.

With regard for all the circumstances, the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee deemed justified, in continuation of the political and moral support for the neighboring Afghan people, further assistance to the Republic of Afghanistan and the development of cooperation with this country in accordance with bilateral state agreements. According to Najibullah, "Afghanistan has no intention of hanging around the neck of a neighboring country and has every opportunity and a wealth of resources for really mutually profitable cooperation."

The last soldiers and officers of the limited contingent of Soviet forces, who on 15 February 1989 left by "Friendship Bridge" across the Amudarya, left behind them not only the infinitely long 3,348 days filled with the sorrow of losses and suffering and the tragic experiences of millions of Soviet people. They left behind a whole era in the surrounding world's perception of us, an era of confrontation and enmity and ideologized dogma and illusions which had repeatedly plunged us into various "undeclared" and "unknown" wars and conflicts.

They took with them hopes of the peace that should come to the long-suffering Afghan land.

### Peace Prospects Viewed

*91UF0503A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Feb 91 First Edition p 3*

[Article by Maj M. Pogorelyy under the rubric "International Notes": "National Reconcilation Is Possible"]

[Text] It is now two years since Soviet forces left Afghanistan. How quickly events in our lives and that which excites us become history and recede irretrievably into the past. But for the people of long-suffering Afghanistan the civil war is not history yet. It is still the brutal, frequently bullet-ridden and bloody present. Although no one, I believe, would deny that much has changed in the time since our soldiers returned home.

I remember well the first reaction of both the leaders of the United States and the chiefs of the armed opposition (they were at that time called "gang-formation leaders") to the idea of national reconciliation advanced by President Najibullah. This proposal seemed to them at that time unrealistic, to put it mildly. In addition, even following the USSR's decision to withdraw its forces the leaders of the opposition and their "sponsors" in the United States, Pakistan, and a number of Arab states stepped up their efforts to topple the legitimate Government of Afghanistan.

However, Najibullah was far from being the "Kabul dreamer" and weak-willed "puppet of the Kremlin," as the West attempted to portray him. He showed himself to be a decisive and wise politician concerned not about personal comforts but primarily his people. It is this—consideration for and an aspiration to realize the hopes and desires of the majority of the population—which has been a reliable foundation of the present political authorities in Afghanistan. And, further, vigorous measures to consolidate society and strengthen the state's defense capability.

Yes, Afghans are tired of war, tired of its senselessness and futility. I still remember the word of Afghan peasants to the effect that the heart and hands of the farmer are needed for work on his plot of land, not weaving around the mountains with a rifle. This is why they decisively support the government's efforts geared toward national reconciliation.

The reforms in Afghanistan's political system were major steps on this path. The position of the Islamic religion has been restored, the proposition concerning socialist building has been dropped, the right of all tribes to choose their own path has been recognized, one party's monopoly of power has been abolished, and a multiparty government has been formed. These democratic changes have been enshrined constitutionally. An end has been put to the painful fratricidal strife within the Afghan People's Democratic Party, which had, according to its leaders, inflicted on the country no less damage than the intrigues of the regime's enemies.

In addition, the Armed Forces of the Republic of Afghanistan, having borrowed from the combat experience of the Soviet Army, have been able, despite the rash forecasts, to hold out in the face of the increased pressure of the government's enemies. Moreover, they have proven capable of conducting successful offensive operations, which are forcing many members of the opposition to thoroughly reconsider their participation in the struggle against the authorities. The mujahidin are no closer to military victory today, the NEW YORK TIMES observes, than in February 1989, when the Soviet Union completed the withdrawal of its forces from Afghanistan. Each day brings news of the return to peaceful life of increasingly new rebel detachments. Some 300,000 refugees have returned to their native parts from camps abroad also.

And one further fact. The desire for a peaceful settlement of the problem on the part of two powers—the USSR and the United States. This aspiration, recorded in the Geneva Accords, is, albeit slowly, being bolstered by practical steps also. At a meeting of foreign ministers of the Soviet Union and the United States last December agreement was reached on the idea, advanced by the Afghan president and supported by both parties, of free democratic elections being held in Afghanistan and the creation of a transitional authority responsible for holding these elections. No less important also is the fact that agreement was reached on a proposal concerning the mutual termination of supplies to this country of Soviet and American arms. Our Union budget envisages assistance—I stress, only economic—for Afghanistan for 1991 on the order of 280 million rubles [R]. Earlier it had reached R3-R5 billion a year, largely thanks to arms supplies. America also allocated up to $600 million a year to arm the mujahidin.

As far as I can see, the Afghan problem is not close to a solution yet. Moscow and Washington have not reached agreement conclusively on all items. Nor are leading circles of Pakistan, which have recently intensified support for the Afghan extremists, operating wholly consistently. And the internal opposition in Afghanistan has not yet laid down its arms either. Consequently, the need for government forces also to be in a state of constant readiness to combat them persists.

But that which is most important has been achieved, for all that. There is now no longer any question of whether a policy of national reconciliation in Afghanistan is necessary or possible. It is a question of how to achieve its speediest realization and of how to impart an irreversible nature to it. And this, despite the continuing problems, is feasible.

## East Europe

### Charge d'Affaires to Albania Arrives in Tirana

*LD2702084891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0805 GMT 27 Feb 91*

[Text] Belgrade, 27 Feb (TASS)—Vyacheslav Durnev, USSR charge d'affaires to the People's Socialist Republic of Albania, arrived in Tirana yesterday evening. Workers of the Soviet Embassy which is to open in the capital of Albania arrived with him.

Representatives of the Albanian Ministry of Foreign Affairs met the Soviet diplomats in the Tirana airport, ATA reports.

As is known, diplomatic relations between the two countries were restored in July 1990 after an almost 30-year break.

### Commentator Views Future Ties With Poland

*PM2102165091 Moscow NEW TIMES English 12-18 Feb p 25*

[Vladimir Razuvayev commentary: "The West Begins in Poland"]

[Text] Has the Soviet leadership taken due note of the fact that Poland's was the most criticial reaction to the recent events in the Baltics? Hardly, because Moscow seems to be too busy to pay much attention to its relations with Eastern Europe. The dramatic events in Georgia and the Baltics, troubled financial policies, a tattered economy and growing political instability are the major concerns of the Soviet leadership. The rest of the time is devoted to the Persian Gulf, relations with the United States, the European Community and Japan. This may be necessary, but this does not mean that now, in the calm following the East European storm, new problems and differences are not maturing. Very soon Moscow may have to face these problems and tackle them either with the help of another version of the "new political thinking," or by its traditional means.

It is easy to guess that Soviet-Polish relations will be the most critical of these. History has turned these relations into a real minefield, while the present adds new problems. Warsaw demands that Soviet troops be withdrawn first from Poland and then from Germany. The problem of the homebound Soviet troops' transit via Poland remains unresolved. The Polish public is scared by the prospect of millions of Soviet refugees flooding the country in an attempt to escape the dramatic economic crisis and possible political repression in the USSR.

The events in the Baltics were condemned by the Polish Sejm, Senate, Foreign Ministry and government. The Polish ambassador was recalled from Moscow "for consultations." The Polish government continues efforts to establish "special relations" with the Baltic republics, which may include the opening of "information bureaus" in the near future.

Some circles in Moscow regard these actions as political buffoonery, others as "new Polish nationalism," and still others may believe that "the Polish threat" could seriously destablize the situation in the Baltics, Belorussia and the Ukraine. These viewpoints may be correct to some extent, but it is also true that they are far from explaining the deeper factors that shape Soviet- Polish relations.

In his time the celebrated Russian philosopher, Vladimir Solovyov said that Russia's attitude toward Poland is, basically, Russia's attitude toward the West. The philosopher meant the purely religious side of the problem. Since Moscow stopped regarding itself as the official capital of the Orthodox East, Solovyov's words seem to have lost their topicality. But the victory of East European revolutions may breathe new life into the famous philosopher's formula, this time in the political sphere.

Geographically, Poland will never become part of Western Europe and will always remain a neighbour of the USSR (with all the ensuing geopolitical consequences). This proximity will give Moscow broad opportunities to bring pressure to bear on Warsaw, using such means as regulation of energy-carriers' exports and manipulating its import policies (the quality of a great deal of Polish-made goods is so low that Poland can only hope to sell them in the USSR). Theoretically (let us hope, only theoretically) Moscow could pressure Poland using the remaining Warsaw Pact structures.

Today Moscow is free to choose from three options concerning its relations with Poland. The first option is to ignore the troublesome neighbor for some time hoping that the problems will resolve themselves. The second option is to activate powerful levers of influence and to bring the neighbour back to its senses. The Polish government is likely to understand, eventually, who is who in world politics. It is easy to imagine, however, how the Polish public, which cherishes no kind feelings towards its Eastern neighbour, will react to Moscow's resorting to pressure. If Moscow goes this way, the historical mines implanted in Soviet-Polish relations will go off, turning Poland into a hostile antagonist of the USSR.

One should not forget that although Poland is geographically an East European nation, most Poles consider themselves Westerners, at least spiritually. One must not forget the strong ties with numerous Polish communities in Western Europe and North America, communities which are actively participating in the rebirth of Poland economically and using their vast political influence in their host countries. Let us also remember Poland's traditionally pro-Western attitudes and the West's interests (although often time-serving ones) in Poland.

That is why the best choice seems to be to opt for the third variant: Moscow must regard Poland as the doorstep to the West. Naturally, the Soviet Union should not expect humanitarian assistance or billions worth of loans from Poland, and our closest Western neighbour will

remain a problem state in the foreseeable future. But if Moscow is really interested in improved Soviet- Polish relations its diplomatic efforts in Warsaw must be cautious, Moscow must avoid using force and seek compromises as it does in Washington, Bonn and Paris.

...Perhaps Poland is not the only country where the West may begin for the USSR?

### TASS Obvserver on Relations With CEMA

*LD2302220391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1225 GMT 23 Feb 91*

[By TASS international observer Albert Balebanov]

[Text] Moscow, 23 Feb (TASS)—The latest issue of the U.S. magazine 'NEWSWEEK' says that "there is great concern in the countries of Eastern Europe at the reduction in Soviet oil and gas deliveries, and also the decision to switch to reciprocal payments in freely convertible currency, something that has led to a reduction in trade". Well, this concern can be understood. These countries have now found themselves in a difficult position. A reduction in the volume of trade with the USSR is indeed taking place and this risks having serious consequences for them. These countries have been caught unprepared for the new relations with the Soviet Union, with which they had close economic ties during the last 45 years in the framework of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, which is seeing out its final days.

The fact is that, historically, a division of labor emerged within the CEMA, whereby the USSR specialized above all, in the production of fuel and raw materials for all the member countries of the organization, while the latter specialized in the production of finished products, and, above all, machines and equipment for the whole of the CEMA and, particularly, for the USSR.

As a consequence of this, the economies of Eastern European countries have become dependent, to a considerable extent, on Soviet fuel and raw materials. According to CEMA data, these countries have, until this year, imported from the USSR approximately 60 million tonnes of oil and petroleum products which satisfied 70 to 80 percent of their requirements. As for natural gas, the dependence on Soviet deliveries is 100 percent. This also applies to the deliveries of Soviet iron ore upon which the ferrous metallurgy of the European CEMA countries was based completely. The import from the Soviet Union of other types of fuel also remains very high.

From this year, the Soviet Union retains only 30 percent of the barter deals with its CEMA partners, marketing its oil only for freely convertible currency. This means that the Eastern European CEMA partners must get this currency from somewhere. But it is an extraordinarily complex matter for them, since it is impossible to earn hard currency for the uncompetitive output they produce. Only some 25 percent of Eastern Europe's output approximates world standards. But even selling it on Western markets is very difficult due to a most vigorous competition on the part of better-known firms. "We no longer have any place to sell our output", CSFR Prime Minister Marian Calfa recently complained. Under these conditions, a structural reorganization of the economy becomes a real imperative for Eastern Europe. It is, however, evident that many decades will be needed to implement this reorganization.

As for the curtailment of Soviet deliveries of fuel, energy-producing and other raw materials, it is also explained by the fact that in the USSR itself there are less and less of them, since the best deposits are almost exhausted. In order to develop new ones, both time and large capital investments will be necessary. The problem is that not a single CEMA partner now has excess capital.

The USSR and its CEMA partners are closely interlinked economically and it is impossible to break these ties without serious economic and social damage to all interested sides. This situation objectively prompts the countries of Eastern Europe toward continuing trade and economic cooperation with the USSR within the framework of a new organization of multilateral cooperation which will soon replace CEMA.

I am convinced that a collapse of this cooperation would also be inconvenient to the West. The overcoming of the difficulties that have now emerged in the trade and economic relations among the CEMA partners depends on the progress in restoring their economies to health.

### Former Bloc Countries' Wish To Cut Links Noted

*PM2602110191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Feb 91 Union Edition p 6*

[Correspondent F. Lukyanov report: First Declaration: Are Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia Returning to Western Structures?"]

[Text] Budapest—Helping one another to "return to Europe" and affiliate with all-European institutions and organizations—that was how J. Antall, L. Walesa, and V. Havel, the leaders of Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia respectively, characterized the point and character of cooperation at the meeting in the historic Hungarian city of Visegrad.

As for the question of a "triple alliance," the delegation leaders stressed during their international news conference that cooperation among the three countries does not have a bloc character and is not directed against other countries. In J. Antall's words, the "troika" is not creating any organizational structures and in time other countries may join it. But it was added that, at the moment, "it would not be expedient" to accept new members...

As the signed declaration stresses, the similarity of the sociopolitical situations in the three countries gives them an incentive to strive for their agreed aims—the full restoration of state independence, democracy, and

freedom, the building of a rule-of-law state, parliamentary democracy, and a modern market economy, and also full affiliation to Europe's political, economic, and legal systems, including the security system.

As for the EEC, the meeting said, all three countries—Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia—have already stated their intention to become full members of the community. Recently, incidentally, talks began on granting Hungary EEC associate member status. After that there will be similar talks with Czechoslovakia and Poland. Hungary, meanwhile, has become an associate member of the North Atlantic Assembly. There is frequent high-level discussion in both Prague and Warsaw nowadays about the need for NATO membership. So it is not hard to imagine that, after affiliating with Europe's political and economic systems, the "troika" will most likely seek full membership in NATO, too.

As expected, the leadership of the "troika" confirmed their previously agreed position that the Warsaw Pact's military organization must be disbanded in the near future. In this regard it was proposed that a meeting of Warsaw Pact member states be held to discuss this question on 25 February in Budapest. With regard to the Warsaw Pact's political organization, Hungary, Poland, and Czechoslovakia hold the view it should be disbanded before the end of 1991, or at any rate before April 1992.

Assessing the results of the triple summit, many observers are noting the clear desire of the former socialist countries to more quickly put behind them the things which linked them to the USSR, to a considerable extent influenced by the instability of the situation in the Soviet Union, and to wholly devote themselves to the process of "returning to Europe."

## West Europe

### Yanayev Meets With German President 24 Feb

*LD2402213591 Berlin ADN in German 1826 GMT 24 Feb 91*

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—The one-hour talk between President Richard von Weizsaecker and Soviet Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev at Moscow's Sheremetyevo Airport on Sunday afternoon was "good and interesting," according to the German ambassador to Moscow, Klaus Blech. As he told ADN's Moscow correspondent after the meeting, a "good level" of German-Soviet relations was noted. They had spoken particularly about issues connected with the forthcoming ratification of the German-Soviet Treaty on good-neighborliness, partnership, and cooperation, and of the two-plus-four treaty by the Soviet parliament. The ratification of these agreements is expected to take place in the first week of March.

Immediately prior to the meeting between the two leading politicians, Yanayev had said in an interview carried by the Moscow news agency Novosti that the ratification process will "not be easy." There still have to be "some efforts" and "some clarification of details." "We cannot advocate that those who served the former GDR should be persecuted and exposed to moral terror in connection with the campaign in the FRG," said the Soviet vice president. "We cannot remain indifferent if these people lose their jobs and suffer other unpleasantness." According to the German ambassador, Yanayev had not mentioned these critical remarks in his talk with the federal president. Speaking to NOVOSTI, the vice president stressed the interest of the Soviet Union in developing relations with Germany. These relations are a "very important element of our policy, of our foreign policy priorities and in the construction of the pan-European house."

### Western Forces Commander Meets With Genscher

*LD2602211591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2030 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] Bonn, 26 Feb (TASS)—In Bonn today H.D. Genscher, FRG foreign minister, received Col. Gen. Matvey Burlakov, commander-in-chief of the Western Group of Forces.

As the press service of the FRG Foreign Ministry had reported, H.D. Genscher emphasised that he wants Soviet servicemen and their families leaving Germany in conjunction with the withdrawal of Soviet Army Units stationed on his country's territory part with Germans as friends and to retain pleasant memories of the time they have spent here.

### More Cash Wanted for Withdrawal From FRG

*LD2402142191 Berlin ADN in German 1355 GMT 24 Feb 91*

[Text] Bonn (ADN)—The Soviet Union wants more money in addition to the financial aid of 1 billion Deutschemarks promised by Bonn for the withdrawal of the Red Army from Germany. The AUGSBURGER ALLGEMEINE (Monday edition) reports that this was made clear by the spokesman of the western group of Soviet Armed Forces, Colonel Dmitriy Timashkov. The demand was explained with reference to the higher cost allegedly incurred as a result of Warsaw's refusal to permit the transportation of about 550,000 Soviet troops through Poland.

Timashkov also hinted at a desire for more German money for military housing construction in the Soviet Union. The 7.8 billion marks promised by Finance Minister Waigel are also sufficient for the construction of 36,000 homes. However, 55,000 are needed for the returning soldiers and their families.

The spokesman told the paper that the Soviet troops refuse to accept responsibility for environmental damage to the routes used by them in Germany. The authorities of the former GDR never imposed any conditions on the Red Army in that area. Therefore, any demands for

eliminating possible environmental damage are considered "unjustified." However, the Soviet commanders have been instructed to adhere to the considerably more stringent FRG environmental regulations.

(The article was prereleased to ADN)

### EC's Mixing of Politics, Business Criticized

*PM2602123991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Feb 91 Second Edition p 5*

["Editorial Commentary": "Politics and Business Are Different Things"]

[Text] At last week's meeting in Luxembourg the EC foreign ministers decided to continue work on the program of aid for the USSR. In the communique made public at the close of the meeting the heads of the diplomatic departments of the "twelve" urged the EC commission "to resume its preparations to implement the decisions adopted at the European Council session in Rome 14-15 December as regards granting the Soviet Union credit for food purchases and technical aid." At the same time they "reserved the right" to return to this question at the EC Council meeting in Brussels 4 March and "continue to keep an attentive eye on events in the Baltic in the hope of securing a political solution."

As is well known, at the end of January it was decided to somewhat slow down, but not break off, preparations to provide this aid "in protest at the bloody events in the Baltic republics." It was also decided to postpone the conference on economic cooperation scheduled for late January within the framework of the trade agreement signed with the USSR.

What impelled the EC little more than a month later to once again change its attitude to providing the USSR with aid and return to its original stance enshrined at the Rome session in mid-December? Observers link this change with the recent visit paid to Moscow by the European "trio"—the Italian, Luxembourg, and Netherlands foreign ministers—and their meetings with the USSR president. "We think that Mikhail Gorbachev is fully determined to implement the policy of perestroyka in the USSR and intends to resolve the Baltic problems within the transformed Union and expects understanding from the West," French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas, who has also recently paid a visit to Moscow, said.

So, has the misunderstanding been removed and is our cooperation with the EC countries returning to normal? I would like to believe that. But I will not draw hasty conclusions. After all, we are living in a very changeable time, rich in highly unexpected shifts. Might the further development of the abovementioned Baltic situation and the actions of the USSR supreme authorities suddenly prove once again not to be to someone's liking in the West? Especially since people there are continuing to "keep an attentive eye" on this. If events suddenly take what the West believes to be an undesirable turn, people there "reserve the right" to react appropriately.

The stereotypes of confrontation are still with us.... It was during the "cold war" period—whether it was events in Afghanistan, emigration from the Soviet Union, or any of our other strictly domestic affairs—that people preferred to resort immediately to all manner of sanctions, embargoes, and other levers for blatant economic pressure. Remember the notorious Jackson-Vanik amendment or the embargo on grain shipments to the USSR. They were sometimes self-damaging. It is now well known that the latter caused U.S. farmers and the U.S. Government billions in losses. There were enough countries in the world who readily agreed to supply the USSR with the missing agricultural produce.

Business and politics are by no means one and the same thing. But, as recent events have shown, there are still influential forces in the West who prefer, in the words of one of A.S. Griboyedov's heroes, to "confuse these two pursuits."

### Bessmertnykh on European Culture Cooperation

*PM2602090191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Feb 91 Union Edition p 4*

[Correspondent V. Vernikov report: "Road to Cultural Community. USSR Foreign Minister Takes Part in Work of Council of Europe"]

[Text] Madrid—The special session of the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers in Madrid did not last long—the 25 European states' foreign ministers spent just a few hours together in the Palace of Congresses. After discussing this organization's current problems in view of the present international situation on the continent and in the world, the meeting's participants unanimously welcomed Czechoslovakia into the Council of Europe and exchanged opinions on the possibility of admitting in the near future Poland, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Romania, which have expressed a desire to join. The Soviet Union has still not officially raised the question of its admission, but is trying to do its utmost to develop bilateral relations with the Council of Europe, which is well known for its democratic foundations and traditions and its intellectual and political openness.

Since taking up the post of chairman of the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers in November 1990, Spain has done a great deal to impart all-European parameters to its activity and to broaden cooperation and collaboration with the countries of East and Central Europe, especially with the Soviet Union, by including the USSR in a number of conventions that form the legal foundation of this organization. Spain's foreign minister, F. Fernandez-Ordonez, has said that broadening ties with our country is one of the priorities for the Spanish mission at the Council of Europe and that Madrid intends to "take another step to meet Moscow halfway." That is why the interest aroused by USSR Foreign

Minister A. Bessmertnykh's coming here is not surprising. He took part in the special session of the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers, had meetings with Spain's leaders on questions of further developing bilateral Soviet-Spanish relations, and also held talks with several countries' foreign ministers.

In his speech at the special session, the Soviet minister spoke of the real preconditions for further developing the Helsinki process and progressing in building the common European home. He warned those politicians in Europe who are leveling accusations and sowing suspicion against us in connection with the difficulties of perestroyka, since this jeopardizes the "fundamental foundations of the new European system, our common strategic aims enshrined in the Paris Charter, and other highly important documents." The minister also said that the Soviet Union subscribes to one of the Council of Europe's fundamental documents here in Madrid—the European cultural convention—which attests to our desire to further establish active bilateral ties with the Council of Europe.

After C. Lalumiere, secretary general of the Council of Europe, was officially notified of this, your correspondent asked A.A. Bessmertnykh to comment on this event.

[Bessmertnykh] I consider this event extremely significant. It is a fundamental agreement of all-European importance, providing incentives for the mutual spiritual enrichment of the continent's peoples. It is an important support for shaping a European cultural space. Our adherence to this convention represents a major step in the Soviet Union's carrying out its commitments in the cultural sphere under the Helsinki Final Act and the fundamental accords enshrined in Paris in November 1990.

I see the invitation for the Soviet Union to subscribe to the European cultural convention—an invitation that won unanimous approval from all members of the Council of Europe—as recognition of the role played in, and the contribution made by the Soviet peoples' culture to, all-European culture and as confirmation of our culture's "European identity" (it is, after all, no secret that people still sometimes try to cast doubt on this) and its community with the spiritual sources, traditions, and property of the other peoples of Europe. The fact that this realizes the historical significance of the transformations under way in our country is of particular importance. In deciding to invite the Soviet Union to subscribe to the convention, the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers took note of the policy of reform and openness being implemented in the Soviet Union—a policy that is specifically characterized by its thrust toward political pluralism, democratization, respect for human rights, the supremacy of law, and the development of a civic society.

In subscribing to the convention, the Soviet Union is pledging to abide by the lofty standards of European cultural policy, take an active part in joint actions designed to defend and encourage the development of European culture, and broaden its national contribution to Europe's common cultural assets.

An important practical aspect arising from our subscribing to the convention is the opportunity for our cultural figures and creative intelligentsia to participate in various foundations, organizations, and numerous programs operating on the basis and within the framework of the European cultural convention.

We are certainly interested in involvement in such programs in the sphere of culture and education as the organization of European art exhibitions, the formulation of all-European cultural itineraries, the introduction of Europe-wide basic knowledge of human rights and other countries' cultures in school programs, and the creation of a network of information centers on university programs. Along with programs to develop new methods of teaching living languages and teacher training, to centralize the results of all-European educational studies, and systematize grants for teachers at schools and higher educational establishments.

I would note that we are not starting our cultural cooperation with the Council of Europe from scratch. The Soviet Union is already a party to conventions safeguarding our architectural and archeological heritage. The question of subscribing to the convention on equivalent diplomas and length of education at higher educational establishments is under discussion.

I am sure that both politics and culture stand to gain from our subscribing to the European cultural convention. There will be fresh opportunities for creative contacts for our intelligentsia. That is the most important precondition for a peaceful harmonious future for our continent.

## Supreme Soviet

### USSR Supreme Soviet 25 Feb Session

*LD2502203291*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1851 GMT on 25 February begins its report with recorded portions of the USSR Supreme Soviet session held in Moscow.

The announcer introduces the program saying that Vladimir Orlov, chairman of the USSR Central Commission for the Referendum, gave a report on preparations for the referendum. Orlov explains that in some areas of the USSR preparations for the referendum are not going ahead, such as in Georgia, Moldova, and the Baltic. He mentions the recent Lithuanian poll and reiterates that from the USSR's point of view the poll's results are invalid.

Orlov stresses the right of all to have their say on the future of the country. Depriving citizens of this right is a violation of human rights. Orlov sets out some of the organizational details of the forthcoming referendum. Soviet citizens residing abroad will have similar rights to vote in the referendum as in elections. He goes on to explain the procedure for the participation of servicemen serving abroad.

In conclusion, Orlov stresses the importance of the referendum for insuring stability in the country and calls on all citizens to participate in this historic event and in its preparations.

At 1906 GMT the announcer says: "The first to speak at today's USSR Supreme Soviet session was Deputy Akhromeyev. On the instructions of the country's Supreme Soviet he has travelled repeatedly to the Republic of Moldova to elucidate the reasons for the conflict situations that have arisen there. Among other things, Comrade Akhromeyev said:

"[Akhromeyev] The majority of the people of Moldova today show confidence in the USSR Supreme Soviet and president, and I have to report to you that this confidence has improved, has risen, as a result of the decision on holding a referendum. But there is also influential forces—and some of the people are behind them, this has to be stated directly—which come out against the unity of the Union. In Moldova, this is the People's Front of Moldova. It makes calls for a break with the communist empire and also allegations about the illegality of the way in which Moldova became a part of the USSR, and consequently about the illegality of the forthcoming referendum. It is said openly that there are now no Moldovan people, but there are Romanian people. There is no Socialist Soviet Republic of Moldova, but there is a Romanian Republic of Moldova. That is their stance.

"In Moldova, people divide not according to ethnic but according to social considerations. The greater part of the people, a considerable part of the Moldovans, and I would say a majority, an absolute majority of Russians, Ukrainians, Gagauz and Bulgarians are in favor of a single, federative Soviet Union, and in favor of a socialist state. A smaller part of the population, with the People's Front and the republic's leadership at its head, are in favour of Moldova's leaving the Soviet Union, and of the elimination of socialism. They'll tell you that that is not so, that the republic's leadership is not in favor of withdrawal, that the republic's leadership is allegedly in favor of a confederation: But what kind of confederation is it where there are no Union bodies of power, where there is no USSR Supreme Soviet, where there is no USSR Government, no united armed forces, not even united finances, and there is no issuing of money.

"Of course, in this particular case, confederation is a screen; in practice it means the breakup of the Union. Since it is life, as they say, that has shown us this contradiction now, I believe that because of those decisions which are written down in our draft decision that the appropriate authorities in the town and in the countryside have the right to make a decision to hold a referendum. I believe that it is right, I consider that it is right.

"In this connection I would like to dwell on one question about which, for some reason or other, our comrade people's deputies are shy of talking here. The whole time we hear slanders against the center, criticism of the center: The whole time we hear that the center is an obstacle to happiness, that we are allegedly breaking the laws of the republics and the rights of the republics. I would like to ask: What is happening today? In my opinion the kind of situation has arisen today in which the main destabilizing forces in the country are certain leaders of the republics. They disregard the USSR Constitution, yet for some reason or other we talk about this very rarely. But that is the fundamental law of our country. And we very rarely say that those who talk about an empire are talking a deliberate falsehood. Yes, there have been a lot of mistakes, but we have not been living in an empire, we have been living in a Union, where very many rights have been provided for the republics and very many rights for the peoples. The economy of our country, the economy of our Union republics, has not developed just like that. Where would it have come from had it not been for these rights?

"I consider that the draft decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet on measures to ensure the holding of the USSR referendum on 17 March is, in the main, correct: It should be adopted and we should be guided by it."

The announcer then says that Supreme Soviet Chairman Lukyanov introduced Alfred Petrovich Rubiks, USSR Supreme Soviet People's deputy and first Latvian Communist Party (CPSU) first secretary, who made the following statement:

"Respected comrade deputies! We all know by now that Latvia has found itself among those Union republics whose supreme bodies of power and administration are

blocking the fulfilment of the decision of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies and of the decision of our country's Supreme Soviet on holding a nationwide referendum on the issue of preserving the USSR. A Republican commission for the referendum has not been set up. The borders of constituencies for holding the vote have not been defined. Constituency and ward commissions have not been set up.

"On 12 February, the majority faction in the Supreme Soviet of Latvia, which represents the Popular Front and the nationalist- separatist movement for the national independence of Latvia, which joined the former, the so-called Congress of Citizens of the Latvian Republic, which was earlier declared an unconstitutional organization by the Latvian Supreme Soviet, and also other ultraradical formations, decided to conduct an opinion poll among Latvian citizens on 3 March this year. It was done on behalf of the entire Supreme Soviet, irrespective of deep legislative crisis, when the opposition represented by the Equal Rights [Ravnopraviye] faction, who have 60 mandates out of 201, had not been participating in the joint sittings of the Soviet for a month. As the decision puts it, the aim of the poll is to find out—I quote—the opinion of Latvian citizens on the issue of restoring the independence of the Latvian Republic and to substantiate the work of the state power bodies for governing the Latvian Republic during a transition to complete state independence. This is the end of the quotation.

"The residents of Latvia are asked the following question: Are you for a democratic and independent Latvian Republic, to answer either yes or no. This decision of the Popular Front faction of the Supreme Soviet has been taken in Latvia as a mode of non-participation in the 17 March referendum. The organizers of the poll do not conceal the purposes for which it is being done.

"Such a position by legislative bodies on the USSR referendum deprives those USSR citizens who live on Latvian territory of expressing their will freely, as far as the issue put forward to the referendum is concerned. This is happening, given the fact that over 400,000, or about 20 percent, of Latvian electors last year signed a demand to hold a referendum. This is well known by the Popular Front and the republican Supreme Soviet. It turned out that far from all local soviets of people's deputies are ready, following in the steps of the Latvian Supreme Soviet, to ignore the will of their electors concerning the referendum. A number of soviets in Riga and in the city of Daugavpils, the second largest in the republic, have decided to organize a referendum on their territories. Led by the will of hundreds of thousands of our electors in the republic, who demand that we defend their inalienable rights and interests as established by the USSR president and expressed in his speech on Central Television on 6 February this year—I am quoting—The USSR Supreme Soviet should do everything possible in this siutation to give each citizen a chance to express his or her will concerning the future of our Union—end of quote—the Equal Rights faction of the Latvian Supreme Soviet has instructed me to ask the USSR Supreme Soviet to adopt additional measures in order to guarantee the observation of the rights of the USSR citizens on Latvian territory.

"Proceeding from this, let me submit several specific proposals to a draft which is being examined today.

"First of all, we would have thought it expedient to write as the first paragraph of point three an instruction to the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, or to the Central Commission for the USSR referendum, to approve the composition of constituency commissions on the basis of ethnic-territorial constituencies for electing, in this particular case, USSR people's deputies from Latvia. Accordingly, constituency commissions should be granted a right to approve ward commissions, because being under the pressure of the republican supreme soviet, most local soviets will be too frightened to set up such commissions. This regulation should be entered into into paragraph two of item three. The proposed version does not make it clear who approves the constituency, and ward commissions for the referendum which are being set up at enterprises, establishments and organizations. When proposing this procedure, we proceed from the fact that the referendum is a state matter and not a public one.

"Second, the regulation recorded in item six ought to be extended to cover the territory of those republics which refuse to organize the referendum. To be precise, it ought to be permissible to start the voting earlier, three or four days before 17 March, because we will have to surmount serious organizational and transportation difficulties. One day simply won't be enough.

"Third, members of servicemen's families should be allowed to vote at their military units to avoid additional complications when they vote in accordance with their place of domicile.

"Fourth, a separate item should be recorded, it could be point number four, which would oblige local soviets to provide room for and lists of electors because no one else can do it.

"Fifth, since supporters of the referendum on the issue of preserving a renewed Union still do not have a chance to express their views on republican television and radio, in our view, such an opportunity should be given to them by central television and radio, otherwise we do not have any means of propaganda and information.

"By introducing all these proposals, we firmly believe in the necessity of preserving the Union as a guarantor of human rights in our multinational state and as a guarantor of peace in the whole world.

"In conclusion, it is easy to see that the referendum is being sabotaged by those who speak louder than anyone else about democracy and the necessity to fall back on the wish of the people itself. With the example of our republic, it is clearly seen that those political forces and

the bodies of state power set themselves the goal of reducing the Soviet Union to ruins, to secede from it at any cost, and to create a totalitarian nationalist regime following the example of the Constitution of 1922 on Latvia's territory. Taking into account the topicality of the referendum and the lack of time for discussions, I propose to adopt this decision after the amendments with regard to the discussion are introduced."

At 1917 GMT Deputy Yudin expresses dissatisfaction with the preparations for the referendum and calls for more extensive dissemination of information.

Deputy Fomenko asserts the importance and value of the USSR. She looks at the plight of refugees in the country and rejects the idea of splitting up the Union into tiny parts. She says she is confident that the people will have their say. When the people vote, she says, they have to see that they are voting for a Union that will guarantee their rights and freedoms.

Deputy Engver expresses support for the referendum and rejects any idea of the USSR's collapse. The country has changed before and it will change again, he says, but it must maintain its integrity, its history, its culture, and so on.

The deputies approve the resolution which instructs the bodies of authority to carry out preparations for the referendum, and to set up referendum commissions.

At 1929 GMT the announcer notes that Prime Minister Pavlov spoke at the session. A recording of some of his answers to questions on the structure of the Cabinet of Ministers follows.

At 1945 GMT the announcer notes that debates went on longer than planned and that a report on the Gulf war was given by Deputy Vezirov.

The announcer then says that Internal Affairs Minister Pugo presented USSR Supreme Soviet deputies with the latest information about the situation in South Ossetia. A recording of Pugo follows:

"Since the beginning of the conflict, 33 people have lost their lives, including 14 people of Ossetian nationality and 19 of Georgian nationality. One-hundred and forty-five people have been injured. Ten people working for the law and order forces have been killed, and 32 wounded. The USSR Internal Affairs Ministry is taking measures to stabilize the situation and to assist the population. Mobile generators have been sent to the oblast. Foodstuffs and fuel are being handed out by the internal troops and the Soviet Army. They are also guarding the (Rukhskiy) delivering foodstuffs and essential goods. In accordance with the USSR Law on the Duties and Rights of the Internal Troops of the USSR Ministry of Internal Afairs while protecting public order, they are taking part in stopping public order disturbances, reinforced patrols, and road control duties. Three-hundred and twenty-nine people are being detained for curfew violations. One-hundred and forty-seven firearms have been confiscated. Sixty-two criminal cases are under investigation.

"At the same time, the internal troops' scope for action has been substantially curtailed in connection with the fact that the state of emergency regulations have been extended for a month only in the town of Tskhinvali. The second point of the USSR Supreme Soviet decision of 20 February concerning the extension of the state of emergency regulations to the whole of the territory of South Ossetia has not been complied with, although there has been a constant dialogue with the leadership of Georgia on this store.

"Nevertheless, the acuteness of the situation notwithstanding, I regard it as essential to emphasize that the resolution of the problem in South Ossetia is only possible through political means, through talks being entered into without delay, and also via a compromise between representatives of the Georgian and Ossetian peoples. The initiatives of republics, towns, and national autonomous entities should play an important role in this. A session of the Council of the Assembly of the Mountainous Peoples of Northern Caucasus, held in Nalchik on 23 February, deserves attention in particular. Those taking part called upon the Georgian and Ossetian peoples to enter into talks in order peacefully to resolve the issues concerning South Ossetia's state status and sovereignty."

At 1948 GMT the recording ends. The announcer says that the session will continue tomorrow in separate chambers.

### Pavlov Speaks at Session

*LD2502235791 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1929 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[Text] [Announcer] Prime Minister Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov spoke at today's evening session of the USSR's Supreme Soviet. In his answers to questions from legislators—and there were about 20 of them—he spoke about the structure and functions of the Cabinet of Ministers now being set up. Here are some of his replies.

[Begin Pavlov recording] I would like to begin with a question from Deputy Bobyleva: There is a need to preserve the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry and Instrument Making [Minelectroteckhpribor] and the Ministry of Motor Vehicle and Agricultural Machine Building [Minavtoselkhozmash]. They are working in line with perestroyka. The leaders of the ministries are young and energetic. Why are they not in the structure, and to whom are their functions being given?

The main trend in the organization, or rather reorganization of the industrial ministries adopted in the draft, submitted for your examination, is a consistent rejection of direct state administrative management of production at enterprises; a transition to assisting the formation of

market structures like corporations and concerns and also the transition, bearing in mind the emergence of real economic independence of goods manufacturers, to state management of processes which ensure the economic conditions of enterprises' activity. We proceeded from the premise that in the Minelectroiekhpribor a significant number of enterprises have already, at an earlier stage, become part of independently operating interindustrial state associations, although the nature of the output of this industry, from our point of view, also permits it to blend most effectively and rapidly into the system of horizontal market relations. So, basing ourselves on these two prerequisites, we believed that in this branch of industry there are full grounds for not restraining, but rather stepping up the process of reorganization in the move to market structures.

As far as Minavtoselkhozmash is concerned, and the Ministry of Installation and Special Construction work, [Minmontazhspetsstroy] the Ministry of Transport construction [Mintransstroy], and Ministry of the Oil and Gas Industry [Mineftegazprom], today we propose that they temporarily be retained within the structure of the cabinet, with plans subsequently to transform them into corporations, concerns, and other economic associations. But in these spheres of activity, we believe that so far the preparatory work has not yet been carried out to a sufficient level, so the destruction of the established structure by means of eliminating the industrial center could be of significant detriment, from the management point of view, and have a negative effect on production. So, in this case, we tried to approach this from the standpoint of first building, and only then destroying.

A question from Comrade Alekseyenko. To what extent is turning the Ministry of Metallurgy into a committee justified? Is it essential to preserve the industry as a single complex of the national economy? From Comrade Nesun: I cannot understand the arguments which have persuaded you to change the status of the Ministry of Metallurgy into that of a committee. There are some questions that were not signed: One of them asks how the decision on transforming the Ministry of Metallurgy into a committee is to be understood. By that decision we lose a major industry. We could dismantle the country's metallurgy industry and thereafter the whole of the economy.

Well, at the present time the metallurgical sector has indeed gone along the road of forming a state corporation on a share-holding basis in order to preserve technological unity and economic ties within the industry. Naturally, this reorganization cannot be carried out at a stroke, and it is therefore necessary for the period of transition to preserve coordination of the industry's activity by the state as a base industry for the functioning of other industries. As far as the leadership of metallurgy is concerned, in so far as the Constitution does not place it within the competence of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, we are proposing that a State Committee for Metallurgy be formed, the collegium of which could include representatives of the republics; and the interests of the territorial consumers could be coordinated in such a structure for the period of transition to the market while preserving the integrity of the industry, while in principle this industry, just like any important industry within the national economy, we think should be constructed in terms of its organization upon the principles of a two-level system. The committee should deal with long-term issues, scientific and technical progress, and the implementation of strongpoints for the realization of this basic, driving direction, so to say, in the development, primarily in the high-quality development of metallurgy.

Comrade Rogatin: Doubts arise with regard to the functions of the Ministry of Culture and Tourism. Such practice does not exist in the world. Perhaps it would be better to have a ministry for matters of youth, sports and tourism. Comrade Azarov: Why is it not proposed to set up a ministry or a committee on tourism, especially when one considers this industry's prospects for becoming a large item on the income side of the budget. Comrade Luchenok: Is the formation of a Ministry of Culture and Tourism brought about by the experience of other countries? Will not culture and spirituality suffer in this?

Well, as far as youth and sport are concerned, the intention is to form a state committee, although it does seem to us that perhaps the question should be asked not about youth and sport, but about physical culture, youth... [pauses] physical culture and sport. In our view we have moved aside too much in the direction of professionalism in sport, as they say, but have forgotten about physical culture as the foundation of the health of the population. I do not want to develop this topic, but it seems to us that this is very topical, and it is time to get back to this. Sport is sport, but it carries with it a totally different shade of meaning.

In foreign practice, the organization of tourism has always been conducted by specialized firms. At the same time, in recent years one can trace a tendency toward an increase in the role of the state in the management of this sphere of activity. But it should be borne in mind that this sphere always has two sides, and that includes our country—both the commercial and the intellectual. So we believe that in the commercial sphere we should have, just as in the practice of all, or most foreign countries, the formation of joint-stock companies. As you know, we have already been taking this path, and for some time. From the intellectual point of view, tourism, in principle, runs close alongside the cultural sphere of activity. This, in practice, should be reflected in joint programs of the Ministry of Culture and the former State Committee for Foreign Tourism [Goskominturist]. Therefore, combining them into the Ministry of Culture and Tourism, so to speak, has been carried out in our draft precisely from the point of view of unification on an intellectual basis.

Comrade Kiselev, chairman of the Commission for Consumer Goods, Trade and Other Services: What body

in the government will regulate and tackle foreign economic problems between republics and industries relating to the development of the light industry in the country? Will the USSR Government tackle, as a whole, the problems of expanding consumer goods production, and via which structures?

I do not think you will reproach me for permitting myself to recall Article 132 of the Constitution, in which management of the light industry has already been referred to the jurisdiction of the Union republics rather than the Union-level government. Unfortunately, this complete referral of the light industry to the jurisdiction of the republics, krays, and oblasts was, to put it mildly, not properly prepared, and so this transition has led, today, to the existence of a clear hitch in the work of the light industry, a hitch that is caused precisely by the disruption of management functions: i.e., the untimely concluding of agreements; barriers between republics in the supply of raw materials. But I don't think there is any need to describe in detail how we have cotton in Uzbekistan, while Ivanovo oblast is at a standstill.

So, acting in accordance with Article 132 of the Constitution, at the same time, in submitting the draft for your examination, we also took into account the existing monopolistic nature of the economy today, as well as the need for interrepublican and international ties to be established. So we have come to the conclusion that, without violating the Constitution, it is necessary during the transition period to set up a state committee for the light industry under the Cabinet of Ministers. But we did not regard it possible to include it within the Cabinet of Ministers so as not to contradict the Fundamental Law. We also think that the heads of the relevant light industry bodies of the Union republics could, in accordance with their posts, form part of the collegium of this committee. Furthermore, we think that the balancing of the interests of the republics in the development of the light industry and the production of consumer goods will be carried out fairly as one of the functions of the Ministry of the Economy and Forecasting on the basis of coordinated all-Union programs.

Comrade Kiselev: The committee proposed that a state committee for water resources be set up, but it is not in the structure. To what body will now be entrusted questions of the regulation and distribution of water resources and the commissioning of water-development projects? Well, at present, it is the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee] which, as is known, is dealing with questions of the organization, utilization, and regulation of water resources, trying as it is to approach a solution in an integrated manner, taking into account trends in the socioeconomic development of territories. Subsequently, we are considering that the Ministry of Economics and Planning will fulfill these functions.

As far as production and economic functions in the commissioning of water-development projects are concerned, they are being directly implemented, as is known, by the corresponding economic organizations independently, on-site. Therefore, we have seen no need to set up such a state body to coordinate activities at a Union level.

Comrade Tsybukh, chairman of the Committee for Youth Affairs: I ask that the powers of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, jointly with the republics, be supplemented with the function of implementing state youth policy. There are a lot of grounds for this, including the law on young people which is being prepared. We have proposed the setting up within the cabinet of a statement committee for youth affairs, physical culture and sport. It should start immediately, jointly with the republics, on implementing urgent youth problems. Generally speaking, it is an important question.

Comrade Ivchenko asks: What is the point of the separate existence of a Ministry of Agriculture and a State Committee for Food Purchases? Well, esteemed Comrades, the point of it is that here we have clearly seen that we have not matured enough to the point where we can eliminate, at Union level, bodies for the administration of procurement of agricultural production and agricultural raw material. Today, we have come into direct collision with the fact that we have the necessary resources in some regions, and at the same time we are unable to provide the population and industry in other regions. Therefore, today, we have even had to come to a situation where bread has been produced in the country, but it does not belong to the state. It is there in the elevators, but not the state elevators. Therefore, having analyzed this whole situation, we concluded that we must ensure that even if this function does not cover the whole complex of problems of the development of agriculture and its material-technical supply, payment of wages, and social conditions... [changes thought] This function, which is so vitally necessary for the stabilization of the situation in the country, and for the normalization of supplying industry and the population—we must definitely single it out today, and single it out first and foremost on bread, as well as on certain other issues; well, by that I mean those connected with the supply of centralized resources for redestribution between krays, oblasts, and republics.

Why is a body for questions of a pricing policy not provided for in the structure of the cabinet? The experience of countries with a developed market economy proves that they have strong bodies of state control, and regulation of the pricing policy. Our country is at the very start of the transition to the market, and the coordination of the pricing policy between the republics and the center acquires special urgency at this stage. Apart from that, the 40 percent proportion of state-regulated prices is being retained. Comrade Gritsenko, we have retained... [pauses] I mean, what I have in mind is to have pricing control bodies of the Cabinet of Ministers, and as for pricing, since this is becoming one of the most important levers of economic management, we considered it essential to hand it over to the Ministry of the Economy and Forecasting. If deputies are of the opinion that at this stage a special body should be

retained, then this question can be examined again, although we reckoned that in building an integrated system there is no need for us to be held back by the question of prices at the intermediate stages of the movement toward the market. This will only be damaging, because we see clearly how major trouble was sparked off in our country precisely because one sector of the economy is operating on the basis of free prices, while another sector is operating on the basis of fixed prices—one industry works with firm prices, while another works with fixed prices; one enterprise has this proportion of fixed prices, while another enterprise's proportion is lower. Enterprises which have a 100 percent state order have turned out to be in the most difficult situation now. They are the ones which produce output that is of greater value for the national economy, and they solve the most important tasks from the point of view of the economy which is based, first and foremost, on the pricing policy, and they have turned out to be in the most inconvenient situation. That is why it is essential to create equal economic conditions, and this can only be done given that there is an equality of approach toward prices. [end recording]

## Deputies Discuss Pavlov Report

*LD2502213191 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1626 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[Report by correspondent O. Vasilenko]

[Text] [Vasilenko] USSR Supreme Soviet deputies today discussed the report by USSR Council of Ministers Chairman Valentin Sergeyvich Pavlov on a USSR draft law on the Cabinet of Ministers. Comrade Pavlov answered questions relating to the remit of various ministries and departments. Of course, it is natural that the issue of additional powers in the sphere of legislation for this executive body was at the center of attention. Here are Pavlov's arguments on the issue, and the thoughts of Kalmykov, chairman of the Committee for Legislation.

[Begin recording] [Pavlov] Above all, the question is that considerable discussions have been generated on the issue of whether the cabinet can or cannot adopt temporary decisions on the issues falling within the competence of the Supreme Soviet in case of the president's absence, to put it quite simply, and during intervals between Supreme Soviet sessions. We believed that this right could be given to the cabinet provided that the Supreme Soviet is informed without delay about a decision that has been adopted. Well, many deputies object. I think that this question can be discussed. If there are any doubts, it is better to have them eliminated.

[Kalmykov] What Valentin Sergeyevich has been speaking about now, in other words, Paragraph 5 of Article 4 of the draft says that the Cabinet of Ministers has the right to adopt temporary decisions on the issues of managing the national economy that are within the competence of the Supreme Soviet. The Committee for Legislation and all other committees and commissions that joined us believe that this power should not be given to the Cabinet of Ministers. We are proceeding from the fact that we have extended the powers of the president, and endowed him with the powers that are not characteristic of the executive power, and this is more than is needed. What arguments does the minister bring? He said—I read his last report very attentively—such things as: It can hardly be justified if on every of these issues we will have to resort to the presidential decrees. Thus, the Supreme Soviet is removed and the president is removed on every issue in paragraphs 7 and 10 of Article 113 of the Constitution. It can hardly be convenient or appropriate. There is the permanently working legislature—the Supreme Soviet; there is the president, who can adopt regulatory acts on a number of these issues, and now let us give similar powers to the prime minister and the Cabinet of Ministers. I do not think we should do it. Tomorrow we will give such powers to the Supreme Court, the general procurator. We will share it all out, and there will be nothing left of the Supreme Soviet. I do not exaggerate this issue. It is very serious. If we want to move toward the division of powers, then the legislative power should remain a legislative one, and the executive power remain an executive one. [end recording]

[Vasilenko] Of course, there was a question on whether too many ministries and departments are being created. Nowhere in the world is there such a number—about 50 ministries. It may be wise to limit oneselves to 30-35. Maybe specialists will think about it and suggest a scientifically based structure for managing the economy.

Valentin Sergeyevich Pavlov asked for a special protection immunity for his ministers, so that ministers would be held neither criminally, nor administratively responsible. Yuriy Khabzatovich Kalmykov said that the Committee for Legislation did not especially study the foreign experience on this issue, but in the opinion of the committee it is incorrect, and we will not introduce such immunity. The overall opinion of the deputies is that the draft law needs further work on it, and this will be done on Tuesday and Wednesday—tomorrow and the day after tomorrow—when separate sittings of the chambers will be held in the Kremlin.

Besides, to make the information on today's sitting fuller, I would like to add that the deputies took cognizance of the report by the Committee for International Affairs regarding the situation in the Persian Gulf. It has been decided to adopt a decision on this tomorrow.

A report by Minister of Internal Affairs Pugo on the situation in south Ossetia was also heard. Unfortunately, the situation has not improved. The decision of the USSR Supreme Soviet is not being fulfilled. The confrontation between the sides continues, including clashes with the use of weapons. Enterprises have stopped, and schools and hospitals stopped their work, too. The number of refugees has grown: Both of Ossetians to North Ossetia, and Georgians...[changes thought] Since the beginning of the conflict, 33 people have died.

Despite the acuteness of the situation, the ministers believes that stabilization is possible, but only through political means. He reported that tomorrow, a session of the Georgian Supreme Soviet is to be convened on this issue. The Union legislature took cognizance of this report.

I only have to add that tomorrow, at 1000 [0700 GMT] the Soviet of the Union starts its work. The Soviet of Nationalities will start at 1500 [1200 GMT].

### Referendum Resolution Adopted

*PM2702112891 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Feb 91 Second Edition p 2*

["USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution" signed by A.I. Lukyanov, USSR Supreme Soviet chairman, dated 25 February 1991: "On Progress in Fulfilling the USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution on the Organization of and Measures To Implement the USSR Referendum 17 March 1991"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet notes that in the course of the execution of the resolution of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies, measures are being adopted with the aim of creating the necessary conditions for holding a USSR referendum on 17 March 1991 on the preservation of the USSR as a renewed federation of equal sovereign republics. Questions connected with organizational, material, and technical support for the referendum are being resolved. In the majority of republics, central republic referendum commissions have been set up, voting districts formed, and district and precinct commissions set up, and other measures are being implemented to guarantee citizens the opportunity to participate in the nationwide vote.

At the same time the highest organs of power in certain republics, in violation of the USSR Constitution and legislation, are in effect blocking the implementation of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies decision on holding a referendum. Attempts are being made to change the referendum formula approved by the USSR Supreme Soviet, to add other questions of republic or local significance, or to hold republic polls, plebiscites, and so forth in place of the all-Union referendum.

In this connection the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Central Commission for the USSR Referendum are receiving appeals from local soviets, social associations, labor collectives, and citizens calling for the USSR referendum to be held everywhere. They reflect the awareness that the question being put to the referendum, "Do you think that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics should be preserved as a renewed federation of equal sovereign republics, in which the rights and freedoms of individuals of any nationality will be fully guaranteed," says nothing about changing or consolidating the status of the republics in any way. Nor is there any interference in the internal affairs of sovereign republics, since the referendum involves finding out about the attitude of USSR citizens toward a single problem—the preservation and renewal of federal relations among the country's republics. The messages also rightly point out that depriving citizens of the opportunity to participate in the referendum is contrary to the USSR Constitution and laws, and is also a violation of the human right to participate in the government of one's country, proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international legal documents.

The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. In implementation of the decision of the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies, the highest and local organs of state power and administration in the republics are to adopt additional measures aimed at ensuring the holding throughout the USSR's territory of a referendum on the question of the preservation of the USSR as a renewed federation of equal sovereign republics. Decisions blocking the holding of the USSR referendum in particular localities are unlawful and should not be implemented.

2. It is noted that republic polls of the population on the autonomy of the republics are not legitimate grounds for refusing to hold the planned union referendum, since they do not answer the main question submitted for discussion and put to a vote of all the Soviet people on 17 March 1991.

The highest organs of state power of the republics in question are to immediately adopt measures to create commissions for the USSR referendum, and also to remove all obstacles preventing citizens from exercising their right to participation in the nationwide vote.

3. In connection with the appeals from soviets of people's deputies and from citizens, it is stipulated that in the republics where central republic commissions for the referendum have not yet been set up, rayon, city, city rayon, settlement, and rural soviets of people's deputies are entitled autonomously to form precincts and districts and set up district and precinct commissions for the USSR referendum.

Labor collectives and social associations at enterprises, institutions, and organizations are granted the right to form precincts and districts, as well as precinct and district commissions for the referendum from among representatives of the said collectives and social associations, in order to ensure the participation in the referendum of members of the said labor collectives, members of their families, and other citizens who are deprived of the opportunity to vote at their places of residence. The said commissions are endowed with all the powers of precinct and district commissions for the referendum stipulated by USSR legislation.

Citizens working at enterprises, institutions, and organizations and members of their families are to be included on the main list of persons participating in the USSR referendum. Other persons presenting themselves to vote at precincts formed by labor collectives and social

organizations are to be entered on an additional list, recording their surname, forename, patronymic, and place of residence.

Announcements of the formation of precincts, districts, and commissions as specified in the present point are to be sent directly to the Central Commission for the USSR Referendum and registered by it. The results of the vote are also to be communicated to the Central Commission for the USSR Referendum.

The Central Commission for the USSR Referendum is to take into account data on the results of voting received under the procedure stipulated in the present point when summing up the results of the vote for the USSR as a whole.

4. In connection with a request from the Central Commission for the USSR Referendum, the deadline for forming voting precincts and districts and precinct and district commissions for holding the USSR Referendum stipulated in Point 6 of the 16 January 1991 USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution is extended to 7 March 1991.

5. It is stipulated that voting districts and precincts in military units abroad, and also in troop units of the USSR Defense Ministry, USSR KGB, and USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs in republics where central republic commissions for the USSR referendum have not been set up, are to be formed, and the composition of precinct and district commissions is to be determined, by the troop units' command. Commissions formed in troop units are to be permitted to include on additional lists members of the families of servicemen in the units, as well as other citizens who are deprived of the opportunity to vote at their place of residence.

The results of the vote for precincts and districts formed in these troop units are to be taken into account when summing up the results of the vote for the USSR as a whole.

6. It is stipulated that precincts for voting at Soviet institutions abroad, and also districts, are to be formed, and the composition of precinct and district commissions for the referendum determined, by USSR ambassadors. The formation of district commissions for the USSR referendum is to be permitted where more than three voting precincts exist at Soviet institutions. The results of voting by USSR citizens living in foreign countries are to be submitted by the precinct or district commissions to the USSR Foreign Ministry, brought together by it, and sent to the Central Commission for the USSR Referendum. These data are to be taken into account in summing up the results of the vote in the USSR as a whole. The Central Commission for the USSR Referendum is to permit the vote to be held at an earlier date for USSR citizens living abroad.

7. The Central Commission for the USSR Referendum is granted the right where necessary to resolve other organizational and technical questions relating to holding the referendum in the light of the proposals and comments put forward by USSR people's deputies in the course of the discussion of this question at the USSR Supreme Soviet.

8. In the course of holding the USSR referendum individual procedural norms of the republics' legislation may be applied provided that they do not restrict the rights granted to USSR citizens by Union legislation.

It is stipulated that voting on the question put to the USSR referendum is to take place using a separate ballot paper in a form approved by the Central Commission for the USSR Referendum. Additional questions are not permitted to be included on this ballot paper.

The USSR Supreme Soviet appeals to all citizens of the country to participate actively in the USSR referendum and in resolving a question of historic importance—the fate of our state, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

[Signed] A. Lukyanov, Chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.
The Kremlin, Moscow, 25 February 1991.

## Political & Social

### Democratic Russia Urges 'No' Vote on Referendum

*LD2602212191 Moscow TASS in English 2054 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] Moscow February 26 TASS—The Democratic Russia deputy bloc today decided to agitate voters and press them to say "no" in the March 17 referendum on the need to preserve the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics as a renewed federation of equal sovereign republics.

The reason for the decision is the "incorrect formulation of the referendum question", Vyacheslav Volkov, coordinator of the bloc which comprises 214 Russian people's deputies, approximately one-fifth of the total number of Russian people's deputies.

According to Volkov, the formulation implies the restoration of all the party-economics, administrative and military structures.

The left-of-centre radical bloc of political parties and movements, an association of small radical organisations also opposes the referendum.

A statement adopted at today's extraordinary meeting of the bloc proposes creating a commonwealth of sovereign states on a confederation basis, in which the governing functions will be peformed by the inter-republican coordination committee and the confederation councils.

Bloc members see their main task in the struggle for complete sovereignty of the Russian Federation. They favour putting to a vote in a poll the question relating to the restoration of Russia's independence and statehood.

As is known, the Soviet and Russian Parliaments have spoken out in favour of the referendum. No decision for or against the referendum has been reached in Georgia, Azerbaijan, Moldova, Armenia, Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia. On Monday, the Soviet Parliament declared unlawful the decisions of republican bodies blocking the holding of the referendum

Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev in his speech at the meeting with members of the scientific and artistic intelligentsia in Belorussia today criticised those who favour defederalisation and seeks to pass off this anti-Union and anti- popular plan as the credo of democracy. According to the president, in their struggle for power democrats have entered a political alliance with separatists and nationalist groups.

## Republic Representatives Discuss Union Treaty

*LD2602112791 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[Remarks by republican representatives at a session on discussion of the draft union treaty in Moscow on 25 February; speakers include A. Iskandarov from Tajikistan, R. Abdulatipov from RSFSR, P. Nasyrov from Uzbekistan, V. Isakov from RSFSR, and G. Tarazevich of the USSR Supreme Soviet; introduction by announcer V. Stefanov; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] [Stefanov] Republican plenipotentiaries which are taking part in the elaboration of the draft union treaty held their latest sitting today. Participants of the meeting are reporting on the progress of work on this document, which aims at consolidating new relations of truly equal rights between sovereign states within the union.

[Iskandarov] I am pleased to note that each delegation seeks to come to a consensus on tackling this issue. There is wish to come to an agreement.

[Abdulatipov] It seems to me that at every stage very often, unfortunately, we have to work with new people, new compositions, making the examination of many principled issues more difficult, and everyone starts inventing a new union treaty using some particular terminologies and so on. But we are managing to overcome all this.

[Nasyrov] I see the only complexity of this process in the fact that the period when this draft is being elaborated or let us say finalized is taking place at the time when the process of ethnic self-consciousness is intensifying in the republics and there is the desire to see more sovereignty in these republics.

[Abdulatipov] There are many claims to this treaty, since the level of ethnic self-consciousness is now so high, that if we try to scale this height we will never sign any treaty at all. We should include in it not only what we have today but also what is to come tomorrow.

[Isakov] During the work on the treaty I could not get rid of the feeling that we are working out only its table of contents, that literally every provision of the union treaty, every clause should be developed into a whole package of accords.

[Tarazevich] I still think, however—and it was agreed by those who took part in working on the treaty—that we should not wait for the finalizing stage, we should go ahead and publish it, so that our people in the republics and in the country on the whole know how the work is going, what is being agreed on, and indeed, what decisions to make on the day of the referendum.

[Abdulatipov] The union treaty should be such that a person would want to join the union after reading it. This union would then have a future.

[Isakov] I would like to say that every evening on returning to the hotel I try to make notes, even small notes, because I understand that these discussions and these talks which are taking place here are living history. If we will find—and I am sure we will manage to find, as a result of as many arguments as is necessary—the right decision at the union level with regard to the future of the union, then the elements of stabilization will spread into the depth and they will begin to stabilize the entire system of relations. If we fail to reach it, the entire system will continue to destabilize. Such is the price of the discussions underway in this hall.

## More on CPSU Secretariat Session on Referendum

*PM2602123591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Feb 91 Second Edition pp 1, 2*

[CPSU Central Committee Press Center report: "Preparing for the Referendum: From the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat Meeting"]

[Text] After briefly describing last week's events, V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who chaired the routine sitting of the Central Committee Secretariat, highlighted among other priority areas the activity of party organizations in support of the new Union Treaty.

The closer we get to 17 March, when the question of the USSR's integrity is to be decided, the more central this problem becomes to political life and the public consciousness of Soviet people.

How aware are Communists and other citizens of the significance of the Union's unity? What are the predominant moods during the discussion of the draft Union Treaty? What are party organizations and their elected organs doing to explain the need for the preservation and renewal of the USSR? What is their role in preparing and conducting the referendum?

In view of these questions, interest was aroused by the expert political analysis conducted by the CPSU Central

Committee Nationalities Policy Department in the Chuvash Republic party organization. The conclusion was as follows: In the public consciousness of the republic's population, the future of the Union is linked to the renewed federation. The mood of all strata of the Chuvash population is determined by a desire for the earliest conclusion of a new Union Treaty by the republics and autonomous formations. The Chuvash SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] population's positive attitude to the preservation of the Union as a federation of equal sovereign republics is largely determined by the republic party organization's vital ties with the masses. Communists have outlined and are successfully implementing a program of actions for the period of preparation for the conclusion of the new Union Treaty.

A.N. Girenko, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who addressed the sitting, gave a positive assessment of the Chuvash republic party organization's work in molding public opinion in support of the new Union Treaty. This work does not just mean explaining its role and significance, which is also very important, but is reinforced by specific practical actions to unite all social and national groups of the population, social organizations, and movements which support the integrity of the USSR. The reskom [republic party committee] initiated the creation of national cultural societies, centers, and national groups [zemlyachestvo], and is working on providing favorable conditions for the development of other national languages. There was a proposal to send the document under discussion to other party committees—there are things that people can learn from Chuvash Communists.

Ye.S. Stroyev, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, focused attention on the need to step up the work of primary party organizations in preparing and holding the referendum. He gave his impressions of a visit to the Rostov Oblast party organization and described meetings with Communists at "Rostselmash," the "Azov" Baby Food Combine, other enterprises, and collective and state farms. People everywhere are talking about the forthcoming referendum. People are alarmed at the fate of the Union and are demanding that it not be allowed to fall apart. At the same time, there were criticisms that, in the new political conditions, individual primary party organizations have slackened their organizational and mass political work in labor collectives. This cannot be tolerated. It is necessary to show greater independence and activeness, seek out innovative forms of work with people, and not lose the initiative. There is too much at stake for complacency in these crucial days.

V.S. Shurchanov, first secretary of the Chuvash reskom, who was invited to the sitting, talked about work to strengthen civic consensus on the basis of the ideas of patriotism, internationalism, and the friendship of the peoples. The reskom is trying to work out correct guidelines on problems of nationalities policy. On this basis it is managing to combine the actions of various social groups and movements and to counter attempts to exploit national feelings and fuel political tension.

There are 55 nationalities resident in the Chuvash republic. The reskom has been systematically analyzing the processes and trends in interethnic relations. It is monitoring the situation there rigorously to ensure the observance of the principle of representation in organs of power and management based on the ethnic composition of the population. Party committees have reached mutual understanding and made businesslike contacts with the organs of Soviet power. At the suggestion of Communist deputies, a law has been adopted which stipulates Chuvash and Russian as the republic's official languages. The Declaration on the State Sovereignty of the Chuvash SSR defines the socialist nature of the development of the republic, which is a member of the RSFSR and the USSR. On the reskom's initiative and to prevent a "war of laws," the Chuvash Supreme Soviet has suspended that section of the declaration on state sovereignty which deals with the supremacy of republic laws until the Union and Federation Treaties have been concluded.

As an analysis showed, the republic's Communists are acting as a highly influential political force capable of showing the population that the republic's economy can develop effectively only with the creation of a single economic space, and that the new Union Treaty unites the efforts of all republics, nations, and ethnic groups in society's material and spiritual revival.

O.S. Shenin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who took part in the discussion of this question, named the general shortcoming of the work of preparing for the referendum—namely, that it is often conducted without being linked to a clarification of the CPSU's position on the stabilization of the economic situation. In this connection the participation of party organizations in explaining the role of money compensation and in showing concern for and attention to all strata of the population, particularly those without social protection, assumes special significance.

P.K. Luchinskiy and V.A. Kuptsov, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee, expressed the wish that the document under discussion be augmented by a clarification of the specific forms of work which have developed in the country's party organizations in ensuring the successful implementation of the referendum.

Summing up the discussion's results, V.A. Ivashko noted that the Chuvash reskom is increasing political activeness and intensifying its influence in the republic. This has become possible thanks to the clear stance which it and other party committees in the country are taking. The deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee proposed that the document be augmented by a point in which all party committees must stipulate specific measures for the participation of each Communist in the preparation for and holding of the USSR referendum and an explanation of the need for the preservation and renewal of the USSR.

At the Secretariat sitting, I.T. Frolov, chairman of the CPSU Central Committee Commission for Science, Education, and Culture, reported on a sitting of that commission which examined questions of the state of Soviet science and problems connected with implementing the 28th CPSU Congress resolution "On CPSU Policy in the Sphere of Education, Science, and Culture." B.V. Gidaspov, A.S. Dzasokhov, V.A. Kuptsov, G.V. Semenova, and V.M. Falin, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee; and I.I. Melnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat, took part in the discussion of the report. Speakers noted that the situation prevailing in science and its position in society require serious and immediate action. And above all—on a legal basis. The laws must raise the status of the scientist in society, protect scientific intellectual property, encourage the use of the results of science in all spheres of the state and society, and give them a humanist thrust. It was stated that the party will actively continue cooperation with the scientific community, take part in resolving questions of the social protection of scientists, and support young scientists. It was deemed expedient to examine the question of the CPSU's present-day policy in the sphere of science at the Central Committee Politburo together with leading Communist scientists in the second quarter of this year.

### CPSU Property Worth 4.9 Billion Rubles

*PM2602162991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Feb 91 Union Edition p 7*

[Unattributed report: "Your Call Is From IZVESTIYA: How Much Is the CPSU's Fixed Capital Worth?"]

[Text] IZVESTIYA (No 44) published a report from a press conference given by N. Kruchina, CPSU Central Committee administrator of affairs. The article attracted our readers' attention, but some had what is indeed a valid question: What is the estimated value of the CPSU's fixed assets? We turned to N. Kruchina for clarification.

"The value of the party's fixed assets totals 4.9 billion rubles [R]. Central party establishments' fixed assets—buildings, structures, etc.—are estimated at R133 million."

### Nishanov Interviewed on Union Treaty

*PM2602113791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Feb 91 Second Edition p 2*

[Interview with R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of Nationalities, by correspondents O. Losoto and A. Chernyak; at the "Morzovka" rest home near Moscow on 21 February: "For a New, Renewed Union"]

[Text] What will the USSR be like tomorrow? It may boldly be said that this question leaves no one indifferent. Since the middle of last year work has been actively under way on the new Union treaty, the foundation on which our renewed home will arise.

The fully empowered representatives of the Union and autonomous republics for the elaboration of the draft Union Treaty gathered yesterday in the "Morozovka" rest home near Moscow. This is the second meeting here. We asked R.N. Nishanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of Nationalities and a member of the preparation committee, who opened the meeting, to describe the work which has been done.

[Nishanov] First of all I should like to note the exceptionally conscientious attitude of the representatives of all republics toward the elaboration of the most important fundamental provisions of this document. At the first meeting, in mid-February, the main emphasis was on the delimitation of powers between the Union and the republics.

[PRAVDA] That is the most important...

[Nishanov] Yes. And the majority of disputes centered on this. The section is called "Structure of the Union." It defines the rights which the republics delegate to the Union and the powers which will be joint powers. All the rest is the prerogative of the republics themselves. We have succeeded in making headway on this question and by mid-February the document had already been signed by representatives of the republics' fully empowered delegations who were taking part in the talks. After a brief interval we have met here again.

[PRAVDA] Are all the republics taking part in elaborating the document?

[Nishanov] So far not all. Today nine union and 18 autonomous republics are present. A number of republics are hesitating and some have stated they will not take part in the Union Treaty. But I would not interpret these facts in one single way. Whereas the Georgian parliament has so far not voiced its definitive decision, the Abkhaz Autonomous Republic and the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast are firmly in favor of taking part in the Union Treaty.

As for Armenia, as a whole it is also in favor of the Union, although they have problems with the further assertion of sovereignty. But we have heard no categorical statements about breaking with the Union.

One cannot speak in one single way about the attitude of all Moldova toward the Union Treaty. Voices in favor of taking part in the Union Treaty have been heard in the Moldovan parliament. There have also been speeches against, with people saying that participation in the Union Treaty will violate their sovereignty. But at the same time the inhabitants of the Gagauz regions and the Dnestr region are coming out with persistent requests to take part in the Union Treaty.

Now about the Baltic republics. They have also stated officially at parliament level that they will not take part in the elaboration and signing of a Union Treaty. At the

same time there too some local soviets, many labor collectives, and numerous representatives of working people of what we shall call the nonindigenous population are demanding both collectively and individually to take part in the Union Treaty. That is why in my view the parliaments of these republics should think how better to ensure the rights of all people in the renewed Union.

I should like to note two elements here. On the one hand we are creating a completely new Union on the basis of new, democratic principles where the sovereignty and right of each republic and nation is ensured. Why reject the treaty without having yet seen the document? Is there no logic? And why intimidate people with the claim that some tough center is being created? Is it not better first to study the draft of the new treaty attentively and to investigate everything objectively? And even better, to take part in the compilation of a new treaty and make one's own specific proposals?

On the other hand I should like to note that now all the Baltic republics—Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia—are displaying great persistence in concluding an economic agreement with the Soviet Union. And since there is interest in an economic agreement interest will also naturally be shown in other questions, because there is a Russian-speaking population of 3 million living there and their rights must be safeguarded. I think that if economic agreements appear and if agreements on human rights and social problems appear, a political alliance is possible. That is why this path must not be closed. In general I am by nature an optimist and I should like to hope that all republics will take part in the new Union Treaty.

[PRAVDA] When will the document be made public?

[Nishanov] The republics' fully empowered representatives intend to complete this stage of the work by early March. The document will then be examined by the Federation Council and will probably be sent to the republics' supreme soviets and published in the press.

## Supreme Soviet Referendum Measures Questioned

*PM2602165691 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 26 Feb 91 p 1*

[I. Sichka article: "At Any Price; But Is It Worth It?"]

[Text] Following the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat, the union parliament yesterday also expressed its concern at the course of preparations for the holding of the 17 March referendum. The deputies see the main danger as being the fact that a number of republics are refusing entirely to conduct the referendum on their territory, and others intend to organize parallel republic referendums.

In connection with this, the USSR Supreme Soviet yesterday adopted a resolution in which all higher and local bodies of state power and administration are instructed to take additional measures to hold the referendum over the territory of the whole country, and decisions to block the holding of the referendum are to be considered inoperative, and are not to be carried out. Specifically, in those republics where central republican referendum commissions have not yet been set up, it is proposed to allow local soviets to form voting precincts and districts independently, and to appoint district and precinct commissions for the USSR referendum. Moreover, the same right has been granted to labor collectives and social associations at enterprises.

The Supreme Soviet has repeatedly declared its adherence to observance of the USSR Constitution and laws. However, it looks as if in the present situation it is guided by a "revolutionary sense of justice" more than by the USSR Law "On a Nationwide Vote (USSR Referendum)." This law gives neither the labor collectives, nor social organizations, nor anyone else except the district and precinct commissions the right to carry out work to organize the referendum at workplaces.

Can you imagine what chaos there will be and how many conflicts will arise when the organization of the referendum at a plant, for example, is undertaken in the first place by the CPSU committee, secondly, let us say, by the Democratic Party of Russia, and thirdly by the labor collective council, which trusts neither one nor the other? Not to mention the fact that the Law on the Election of USSR People's Deputies, which regulates the procedure for organizing electoral districts, does not provide for setting up districts at enterprises.

It is completely obvious that the Supreme Soviet's decision will not help society to stabilize or prevent social conflicts. After all, it makes a direct appeal to the local Soviets not to submit to the decisions of the republic parliaments. Because of this the tension between the center and the republics will be augmented by additional tension between soviets at various levels in the republics themselves.

It is hard to imagine that the USSR Supreme Soviet does not realize this. But if it does realize, why is it taking this step? In order to ensure that the referendum will still take place over the whole territory of the country. And in places where the state bodies do not want to hold it, to transfer their functions to social organizations. And thus develop the precedent set by the national salvation committees in the Baltic.

However good the intentions by which the union parliamentarians are guided, it must be admitted that objectively their actions are leading to the collapse of the vertical power structures in the republics, and are provoking a campaign of insubordination toward soviet bodies. As a result this policy might also backfire on the USSR Supreme Soviet itself. For if the population is officially allowed to disobey local state bodies, what will make them obey the same bodies at the center? Especially if the central bodies themselves disregard laws they themselves have adopted.

## Colonel Alksnis Says 'No Avoiding Civil War'

*PM2702153191 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No 6, 10-17 Feb 91 p 7*

[Report on interview with Colonel Viktors Alksnis by Yuriy Teplakov; date, place not given; first paragraph is editorial introduction: "'New Arms for the Army! Ban the CPSU!'"]

[Text] MOSCOW NEWS readers will surely be surprised to see the interview with Col. Viktors Alksnis below. The colonel was surprised himself when we suggested he should talk with one of our writers. Why should we? We do not subscribe to the opinion voiced at the recent session of the USSR Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin that the media should be balanced enough to portray the interests of the majority of the Soviet population. We disagree, whether people like it or not. Nonetheless, we are confident we should give some space to the most visible people in culture, politics, science, etc., even if their views are alien to us.

[Alksnis] "My grandfather, who was the chief of the Soviet Air Force, was arrested in November 1937, a day before my grandmother, and faced a firing squad in July 1938. My father, who was ten at the time, was sent to a children's home. At 16, he started working in a coal mine in Siberia. He worked there until 1957. My grandmother survived the camps by some miracle. We found her in Riga."

This was what Col. Alksnis said for starters. Admittedly, I was curious: I had talked with marshals, but not a single "black colonel", his nickname. I war worried that he might be reserved. My fears were groundless: opennes is his most effective weapon.

"I try not to talk about my family and the past, because many of those who know my background wonder: 'How can you defend the system, the bloody empire that made your family suffer so?'

"I appreciate the logic, but the paradox is that what we see in Latvia is Stalinism in disguise. The proclaimed reason of the 'father of all nations' for his brutalities was class struggle and the interests of the working class; today, the slogan is 'the interests of the nation'. Outwardly different, the two slogans are essentially the same."

[Teplakov] "How is it you see what othe[illegible]on't?"

[Alksnis] "The idea of a closely-knit nation is very appealing to the people. Even greater than a man's love for a woman. Nationalism seems to be a part of human nature. A dark part, to be sure," Alksnis was silent for a second and then continued: "Latvia is suffering. But we'll overcome the crisis. It's a pity we have to waste so much time, and that we're losing our kin. The Alksnises in Riga are no longer a single family. My aunt, who lives in the electoral district where I ran for election, went from door to door urging the people not to vote for me. "Today, I'm alien to my native land and family. Some people even spit in my face in the street. Three years ago, I was a supporter of Latvia's nascent National Front. But let bygones by bygones...I'm afraid blood may be shed.

"I'm convinced there is no avoiding a civil war. We have gone to far. There is no peaceful way out. The advocates of independence will have to deal with a million people they don't want: either have them killed or forcibly deported."

[Teplakov] "I understand that Lativa's problems are close to your heart. But you became popular when the people all over the country heard your ardent appeals against the top people in politics and the state. You didn't spare the ministers in the president's entourage—Bakatin, Shevardnadze, Yakovlev."

[Alksnis] "In politics, one wants to be bigger than one's shadow. It's different in my case. It would be ridiculous to claim that I sacked Shevardnadze. Even thinking that a colonel would try to remove Shevardnadze is nonsense. Some people may profit by claiming I did it. 'Who?' you may well ask. Shevardnadze's real enemies—his colleagues in the state and party hierarchy, following my speech, these people expressed their condolences to the foreign minister, saying that deputy Alksnis was 'slovenly'."

[Teplakov] "Yet the popular belief is that you are an instrument of these people."

[Alksnis] "Yes, I did help them, although I didn't want to. I am proud that I'm independent. I'm independent of Marshal Yazov and the whole of the Politburo. Sure they are trying to manipulate me in their interests. But I defy them all. I'm not attacking Shevardnadze and Bakatin alone: I'm attacking the existence of party cells among the troops which has caused me trouble with the Main Political Department of the Army and Navy. I'm told that the top generals decided: 'Let the man alone for a couple of years—we'll deal with him later.'

"And I know they will make short work of me. I feel I'm doomed. Doomed to failure whatever the situation. But as long as I have my deputy's mandate, I can speak freely and I'll make no secret of my plans."

[Teplakov] "You sound as if you have grandiose plans. Can they be more daring than those of the Soyuz (Union) group of deputies, who are as intolerant of their opponents as the Bolsheviks used to be of theirs? Is that group your creation?"

[Alksnis] "Yes, it is. In the fall of 1989, here at the Hotel Moskva, I proposed the idea and the name. I wrote the appeal and sent it to other deputies. You say Soyuz is intolerant of its opponents. Yet the initial idea was free of all ideology. What I wanted was all-state centrism. Today, I'm contemplating the creation of a truly public salvation committee, one not designed to save socialism, like the Russian Communist Party's top man Ivan Polozkov wants.

"The committee I'm thinking of should save the Union as a state. If we don't stop the perilous degradation we'll be plunged into civil war. A nation-wide salvation committee is the way to do it. A coalition committee to be founded by a congress of people's deputies of the USSR. But neither Gorbachev nor Yeltsin should be members.

"The first thing the committee should do is to ban all ideological debates about the 'betrayal of socialism' and 'return to capitalism'. The committee should be headed by a man of the caliber of Sobchak or Nazarbayev.

"The next step is to institute a state of emergency all over the country. To ban all political parties and movements, the Communist Party included.

"Please note my words. Many people either ignore my vision of the Communist Party or wonder why I should be criticizing it. To repeat: there is no other way, and there should be no exception.

"All economic activity should be based on market relations. Forcefully, if need be. Catherine the Great forced Russian peasants to plant potatoes. Today, potatoes are the only food we produce in adequate supply.

"More often than not, people propose the Polish variant. I suggest we look to Asia for experience. Take Japan. It has overcome economic hardships only because its stability was ensured by the US occupation army. The committee I propose could do something of the sort: keep the country united. After this it will be easy: a market economy demands democracy—the market and democracy are inseparable."

[Teplakov] "Are you saying you want to create conditions for a market economy, which will lead to democracy?"

[Alksnis] "Right. Then we'll start building a normal multi-party system. The parties will compete on their platforms. The people will make their choice."

[Teplakov] "How long will it take?"

[Alksnis] "Five years is quite enough I think."

[Teplakov] "I don't think Mikhail Gorbachev will support the idea, because you will be taking away his power."

[Alksnis] "Gorbachev cannot stop the course of history. A public committee is the only way out. Two months from now, production will plummet 20 to 30 per cent. These are not KGB estimates. These estimates have been made by highly competent people, the key people in industry. This will be catastrophe."

[Teplakov] "But Gorbachev will stand in the way of your plans. He has enlisted the support of the army."

[Alksnis] "He will have to go. The bloodshed in the Baltics will haunt him. He knows he is doomed. I clearly saw this last fall."

[Teplakov] "Was it after your 30-day ultimatum? Many people think you pushed him to do what he did in the Baltics."

[Alksnis] "They are wrong. Many people had turned their backs on the President by then. Take Nazarbayev. On the very first day of the congress he jumped from Gorbachev's ship into Yeltsin's boat. The real issue at stake was that Nazarbayev wanted to become the Vice-President. Certain circles had contacted the Soyuz group to enlist its support. Nazarbayev was ready, the Federation Council was ready, everyone was ready. But at the last moment Nazarbayev saw that Gorbachev was drowning and could pull others down under with him. I'm sure that Shevardnadze left for the very same reason."

[Teplakov] "Did Shevardnadze have the Baltics in mind when he announced his resignation?"

[Alksnis] "I don't think so, although the scenario for the events was written in the Kremlin. But they stopped in mid-stride. Gorbachev is essentially indecisive, both as a man and a politician. Now he has to go."

[Teplakov] "For a long time, the people were being scared out of their wits that should Gorbachev go, perestroyka would die because the omnipresent Politburo would take over again."

[Alksnis] "Wrong. It was Gorbachev and his people who harped on the myth of his exclusiveness. I will fight anybody who wants to push the nation back into the quagmire of recession. I want changes. But I want the changes that would leave us with a single, strong Union.

"Believe me, the Army wants a single state, which is neither capitalist nor socialist. It wants no dogmas."

[Teplakov] "Why then are you defending the generals who stand for the 'socialist choice' and the 'communist outlook'?"

[Alksnis] "By undermining the authority of the top people, they are setting the generals and the lower officers at loggerheads. The army is being undermined from within."

[Teplakov] "Any other reasons?"

[Alksnis] "We are undermining the country by cutting back on the defense budget. We are destroying what has been built over decades. The country used to be nicknamed 'Upper Volta with a lot of missiles'. Some time from now, they may drop the missiles."

[Teplakov] "Do you think that imperialism that is now sending us food relief will attack the 'country of victorious socialism'?"

[Alksnis] "Let me ask you. What will you do if, say, Japan begins to halfheartedly lean on us on the issue of the islands? What will you use to defend Soviet interests? The army today is in shambles, the defense potential is

weak, the technologies are obsolete, and the nuclear shield is agape with holes. I'm afraid that Gorbachev has been awarded the Nobel Prize for having disrupted the system of national security. We should restore the might worthy of a superpower."

[Teplakov] "The shops are empty. They are stealing food even from hospitals. Let's take a risk and leave the defenses as they are, at least for the time being, and take care of the weak and the sick."

[Alksnis] "I don't doubt that everybody needs his daily bread. But if you only knew how badly our Navy needs aircraft carriers..."

And we parted at that...

### Bovin Article Argues for Retaining USSR

*PM2702103991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Feb 91 Union Edition p 22*

[Article by political observer Aleksandr Bovin: "Why I Shall Say 'Yes:' Some Thoughts in Connection With Referendum"]

[Text] Perestroyka, democratization, and glasnost have revealed large flaws in nationalities policy and made it possible finally to see the real picture of interethnic contradictions long concealed behind words about the "flowering and rapprochement" of the socialist nations and about the "Soviet people" as "a new historical community." The "indestructible union" has begun to collapse. That is the truth. For some peoples it is an inspiring freedom calling them to independence. For others—including myself—it is a bitter, agonizing freedom which stresses once again the collapse of many of the ideals and illusions of my generation.

It is clear to everyone that the nature of mutual relations between the republics must change decisively. A new Union Treaty is being prepared. But the problem lies deeper: Will the USSR be retained within its present borders? Will all the republics that now form the Union want to remain within the framework of a common state formation? To judge by the USSR president's 6 February statement, he believes that the referendum scheduled for 17 March should introduce clarity to these questions, that is it should resolve the fate of the USSR.

Perhaps I am wrong but this interpretation of the referendum seems debatable to me.

I shall say immediately that I am a resolute supporter of the retention of the USSR within its present borders and for that reason, despite what is to me the obvious legal inconsistency and political detriment of the way the question is formulated, my answer will be a positive one. Why?

First, logic. There are weighty economic, political, and historical arguments—and the president has partially set them out—which in my view attest to the fact that it will be easier for everyone together to lead each republic and consequently their Union up to the level of modern civilization. And it is entirely within our powers to rectify the errors of the past, to make the Union such that everyone feels comfortable and unconstricted in it.

Second, psychology. Perhaps somewhere in the subconscious Great Russian ideas of empire retain a firm hold. But something else is more substantial. The very fact of living in a multinational country, radio and television, books, music, travel, and daily communication oblige us all from childhood to absorb some elements of the multiplicity of various cultures.

Alongside Russian fairy tales I was read Georgian and Turkmen ones. I knew "Vityaz in a Tiger's Skin" or "Kalevala" [Karelian folk epic] perhaps better than I knew "Igor's Lay." The bookshelves allocated to me at home contained the Kirghiz "Manas," the Armenian "David Sasunskiy." And what about music? And songs? Ukrainian, Moldavian, Georgian songs... The poetry of Alisher Navoi and Firdousi, Taras Shevchenko and Baltrushaytis. I remember what a discovery for me were the mystery-filled pictures of Chyurlenis, the loud colors of Saryan, the precise lines of Krasauskas. I listened to the pulse of the times, reading Ch. Aytmatov, Ch. Amiradzhibi, G. Kanovich, I. Drutse, Ya. Kross, and V. Bykov. And after all in addition to the familiar and precious melodies, pictures, and books, there are also the familiar and precious cities and people accumulated over the decades...

And all this is not alien, not "foreign," but part of my experience of life, my culture, my "I." That is why dividing the Union, breaking off bits of it, is like cutting into living flesh.

I was setting off for Tallinn on one occasion. There were already two "n's" on the end of Tallinn [spelling modification to placate nationalists] and passions were already seething. Complex talks lay ahead. And my wife advised me: Tell them simply: If you go, I shall be sad; after all that is an argument too...

I am writing about my own feelings, my own perception. But I am sure that a sense of commonality, of cohesion, is experienced by millions of people in all republics.

Probably a few years ago it would have been possible at least to find channels to influence the public opinion of, for instance, a Baltic republic. If, of course, one acted intelligently, delicately, with the utmost understanding of "local" pains and anxieties and the thirst for independence which—alas!—is such an impediment to the acceptance of arguments. Unfortunately we were too late. Sensible propaganda in favor of unification was extremely bashful, almost imperceptible. Now that the emergence of "national separatist forces" has been announced, the subtle political work has been replaced by the customary volleys of accusations and curses. What can be agreed on to the sound of such volleys? A purely rhetorical question.

But let us return to the referendum. It is perfectly obvious that the majority will vote for the retention of the USSR. What will that mean in practice? For instance, can a majority consisting of the votes of the inhabitants of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], the Ukraine, and Kazakhstan decide the fate of Estonia or Georgia? Can it forbid them (in the legal sense of the word) from withdrawing from the USSR? I am sure, I am convinced that it cannot. The right to free choice belongs to a given people and no one has the right to decide for them. If it is a case of the fate of Lithuania, then the votes of 2.5 million Lithuanians have greater weight than the slightly more than 100 million votes of the RSFSR. And I very much fear that the results of the referendum will be used somehow to avoid, to talk our way out of this elementary truth, this political axiom.

I repeat once more that I am a resolute opponent of the secession of the republics. That is my stance. And, as a free man living in a free country, I have the right to defend it. But that is not the whole position. If a particular people or particular republic has decided to secede from the USSR, to leave the Union, then as a citizen of a country whose Constitution contains the right to leave the Union, as a Communist, as a member of a party which has always viewed nations' right to self-determination as a program requirement, I am obliged to respect that choice and not to impede it.

The scope for compromise, maneuvering, deception, and self-deception ends here. Here Moscow and primarily we Russians are faced with a tough and crucial choice. Either we find in ourselves the courage to put a stop to our own song and enable those who insist on doing so to leave. Or we send in the special purpose militia detachments and the Army to prevent the implementation of the right to self-determination.

The first option is extremely painful. There will be many malcontents and protesters. We have had our fill of demagoguery and we are hearing the hysterical cries of the supporters of "the united and indivisible." The enemies of perestroyka are being activated (as are the president's political opponents). We will have to pass through all that. But the further into the past the present recedes, the clearer it will be that the most effective policy is a principled policy.

The second option will signify not only the collapse of the new political thinking but also a moral catastrophe. We will be lashing ourselves to the pillory of history. We will drag Russia, socialism, and perestroyka through the mud to such an extent that I do not know when they will manage to get themselves clean. To this day I am ashamed, and will be ashamed for a long time to come, over Hungary, Czechoslovakia, and Afghanistan.

It is criminal to use weapons or the army to silence democracy, to close the paths to independence. But it is no less criminal—and here I move to the third point of my thoughts—to use democracy, glasnost, and the "independently" created paramilitary groups of thugs to create an intolerant situation around the population not indigenous to a particular republic, around the minority that "speaks a foreign language." The events in Sumgait, the Fergana Valley, Dushanbe, and Tskhinvali show the eruptions of violence to which this leads.

People are people everywhere. Blood is always red. And everyone has an equal right to security and the defense of their interests. But I want to speak of what is closer to me and more painful, what strikes my heart more powerfully—the position of the Russian "minorities."

The political regime, the administrative-edict system against which perestroyka is aimed, have stifled and disfigured the whole country and insulted and humiliated all its people. And the Russians have drunk their fill from that cup. The destruction and impoverishment of age-old Russian lands. The extermination of the Russian intelligentsia. Attempts to trample the shoots of Russian national self-awareness. I have in mind not the notorious "Russian spirit" but the legitimate right of Russians—as of any other nation—to treasure their own history, culture, and identity.

But for understandable reasons the "national outskirts" associate and identify the errors and crimes of the Moscow regime and system with the actions of the "Russians." They also identify with the "Russians'" actions the center's present policy aimed at dashing the wave of demands for independence and sovereignty. And therefore everywhere the desire everywhere for genuine equal rights, independence, and sovereignty is interwoven with anti-Russian sentiments. That is understandable. That can be explained. The only trouble is that the "guilty" Russians are a long way off and what are those close by guilty of?

What is a soldier or officer guilty of when he is sent to serve in the Baltic and is reviled and abused now in dozens of newspapers and thousands of posters? What are the officers' wives guilty of when they are refused service in stores and what are the officers' children guilty of when they are not allowed into schools? What are the "simple" workers and employees and their families living and working in the Baltic guilty of? Yet people turn away from them with scorn, intimidate them, and create an atmosphere of moral terror. Counter to the elementary demands of democracy, counter to international and union decrees defending national minorities, people are anxious to separate them legally from the indigenous population, to limit their political rights, and to turn them into second-class citizens.

Action generates counteraction. The Russian population is obliged to consolidate, to unite, to seek methods and forms of self-defense. But the forces are obviously unequal. The extremists are not calming down. But they must be calmed down. We cannot allow rights to be flouted with impunity, allow the dignity of the "foreign language speakers" to be flouted.

At the very start of the last century Nikolay Mikhaylovich Karamzin wrote: "...We are excessively meek in our thoughts of our national dignity and meekness in politics is harmful. He who does not respect himself will undoubtedly not be respected by others. I do not say that love for the fatherland must blind us and make us assert that we are better than everyone in every respect; but a Russian must at least know his value."

That "value" is determined by a lot. But—for the 30 million Russians scattered across the Union in our own Soviet "diaspora"—it is also determined by the certainty that Moscow (not only the RSFSR's Moscow but also the union Moscow) will not abandon them at a difficult time but will help and protect them.

When the Georgians went to war against the Ossetians, now that they are starving out South Ossetia, the union troops have declared themselves neutral. Moscow has kept "above the skirmish." A strange position. Surely the search for a political solution cannot justify the idleness of the union authorities when some citizens of the Union (and it does still exist!) are killing other citizens of the Union? Of course, the president does not want to take superfluous unpopular decisions. But in demonstrating the impotence of the union powers he is providing a powerful argument for those who oppose the Union in general.

While the "ruling clique" is thinking and wavering, checking everything eight times over, the "grass roots" are deciding the question in their own way: Armenians are fleeing from Azerbaijan, Kirghiz are fleeing from Uzbekistan, Russians are fleeing from Tuva and various other places. They are fleeing because they cannot count on protection from the state. That is humiliating both for citizens and for the state.

What will happen after the secession of, let us say, the Baltic republics, if it takes place, is a subject for a special talk. The interests of the "foreign language speakers" must be most strictly guaranteed on the basis of international law. But in the situation prior to secession the "foreign language speakers" must nonetheless pin their hopes not on the United Nations but on Moscow. They must be sure that at a critical moment, if the nationalist elemental forces begin to surge across the region, if a threat to people is created, the president and the union authorities will be able to introduce order.

I shall sum up. I shall take part in the referendum proceeding from the following points:

—it is desirable to retain the USSR, having changed the nature of relations between the republics and of course the name of the Union;

—no one (neither the president nor the USSR Supreme Soviet nor the Congress of USSR People's Deputies) should on any pretext restrict the freedom of choice of the union republics or impede—in the event of a people's sufficiently clearly expressed will—withdrawal from the USSR;

—the rights and interests of national minorities, including the "Russian-speaking population," should be reliably guaranteed by the union authorities—and not only in words but also in deeds.

## Confidence in Reforms Encouraged

*91UN0941A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 7, 20 Feb 91 p 7*

[Article by Lidiya Grafova, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA columnist: "The Sovereignty of the Individual: The Last Chance" subtitled "It is Necessary to Keep Faith in the Irreversibility of Democratic Changes"]

[Text] Remember how inspired we felt at rallies: "The irreversibility of perestroyka—is this the measure of freedom that the people will be able to store up in their hearts?" Just what is freedom for the Soviet person? First of all, deliverance from a genetic fear. And then?...

I do not know about you, the reader, but I have begun to flinch at an unexpected ringing of the doorbell. I caught myself thinking: I have to decide beforehand what I will take and what I will wear if they come for me. "For what reason?" my son calms me mockingly (he, like all young people, has less servitude in the blood). "Why do they need you? You are too honest..."

Actually I, a journalist, did not do anything in particular in the subsiding harvest work of glasnost to fear punishment now. And I despise myself for these "ambitious" thoughts. But what is to be done if, alas, they crawl not only into my head today?

At one time in my youth I tried to write a story about the agony of a person whose thoughts, even involuntary ones, immediately come true. How he tries not to think about bad things...

It is known from ancient mythology that a person who strives to avoid that which is prophesied for him rushes in a bewitched way into the power of fate. Criminology abroad believes that people with a certain psychological makeup become the victims of murders. The victim attracts the executioner!

Thus, what should we do today, when the smell of freshly spilled blood is in the air, when the specter of armored personnel carriers has already made itself felt in the streets—how does one get rid of evil forebodings?

Recently, a prescription could be read on the pages of PRAVDA that was proposed by one respected writer: If politics annoys you and prevents you from living, turn off the radio, do not watch television, and do not read newspapers... Actually, what is simpler than declaring a boycott of glasnost, since it is plunging society into a collective psychosis? Moreover, it is not only false information that renders minds gloomy but also the yell "Guard! They are stifling glasnost!" which contributes to the negative fear in the atmosphere.

Of course, it is interesting (and perhaps even important) to learn that camps and prisons in Magadan Oblast have been repaired, but is it necessary to turn this repair into a sensation? So many friends called me up with a quiver in their voice: Do you know that?... That is, the Magadan measure achieved the psychological effect that someone wanted. With our own active participation. Once again heads are bowing down! Does this mean that we were informed in vain by the "Gulag Archipelago," which is being published now in a multimillion circulation? But what then was the reason for the six years of agonizing glasnost which turned up all the old crimes and graves? For we endured all of "perestroyka" in a recurring hell. For the sake of cleansing ourselves. So that "never, never..."

And suddenly, so quickly? No, this cannot be! If for no other reason than that history does not repeat itself. Then what do we fear? Are they intimidating us? Yes, by fair means or foul. But what is most frightening is that we, having become used to living in collective blindness, and then in collective enlightenment, have not yet learned individually to distinguish truth from falsehood, and we submit ourselves with unusual ease to any social hypnosis.

Politicization of the masses... This is what—simply rallies, strikes, and hunger strikes? But if tomorrow all acts of civil disobedience are forbidden by some new "wise" ukase or order, what will we do, hide in our corners, plug our ears, and close our eyes to politics? It will not happen! Unfortunately, our exhausted generation (how we have gotten tired of fighting!) has not been fortunate simply to live, without participating in politics. This must be understood realistically. Like the fact that participation in politics is not at all a recounting of sensations (all-Union gossip) about democrats and dictators.

"The world will perish if I stop!"—it was under this Tolstoy motto that all dissidents and upright citizens of the Country of the Soviets lived in the dark and enlightened segments of its history. For which they paid dearly. The recent years corrupted us with freedom of speech that was not paid for. Those who had no concept of opposition mischievously threw themselves into the first ranks. The price of glasnost, like the idea of individual efforts, began to decline. Today's toughening climate compels recalling that the liberation of minds is not a simple matter but steady work, happy, but with pain.

To preserve faith today in the irreversibility of democratic changes, not to succumb to despair, and to oppose fear—this, perhaps, is the last chance about which we talked about for so long. But now it really has arrived. Perhaps it is also time to be silent for a while. To meditate. To outline, like in Gogol's "Viy," a circle next to oneself: I make my stand here, and I cannot do otherwise.

Yes, it is dark, but still, as the saying goes, it is not evening. You see, the most steadfast grass grows, as is known, through the asphalt.

## Loss of Faith in 'Democrats' Examined

*91UN0947A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian*
*21 Feb 91 Second Edition p 1*

[Article by Tatyana Samolis: "No, We Are Not Saying Goodbye to Democracy; My Opinion"]

[Text] Recently there has been nothing but talk about the fact that our president is moving to the right, toward conservatives dreaming of a return of dictatorship, that his closest aides—intellectuals and democrats—might abandon the presidential "ship," that censorship might return once more, that perestroyka might come to a halt altogether, and that the time is coming, it would seem, for a parting with democracy.

There you have it: We have yet to live under conditions of genuine democracy even and are already parting from it. Why are we being so quick to part and simply showing no patience!

Nonetheless, granted all the strangeness and complexity of the situation, I venture to maintain that, yes, we are saying goodbye. But not to democracy, not to perestroyka. We are saying goodbye to certain illusions and certain people who even recently seemed to us symbols of our hopes, but who are today demonstrating a hatred for the authorities and a disrespect for opponents' opinions.

Democracy and individuals in our life are not, after all, one and the same thing. Let us not equate things here. People come and go—each time has its heroes. People go, but the thirst for democracy remains. There is no returning to the past. Society never wants to go back to the place from which it has with such torment been breaking free. There will surely be setbacks on its path and ebbs and flows of enthusiasm and emotions. There will be disappointments, but, I repeat, it is impossible to return voluntarily to what was. Our recovery of sight came at too high a price.

The readers are confronting our editorial office with many questions: "Whom To Believe—Gorbachev or Yeltsin? Perestroyka: Where Is it Going?" Some readers, disheartened and confused, are in the throes of dramatic feelings, tragedy even. It is difficult to follow the changes, comprehending their meaning is even more difficult at times. Yesterday, for example, the democrats were leaning on Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, accusing him publicly of all sins, calling him the culprit of the people's troubles, demanding the resignation of the "unpopular" Union government.... But today? There are in the independent press today frankly sensational revelations: what a good man, apparently, Nikolay Ivanovich was, what a decent government we had! What is this: a sincere reassessment of values or a "subtle" hint that the good Ryzhkov has been followed by the bad Pavlov?

Even the figure of the president, incidentally, whom some people were even yesterday worshiping, is today being subjected to furious attacks. What has brought about such metamorphoses? Everyone will judge for himself. But just try after all this to soberly rely on words....

People generally are not now all that interested in who's who: conservative, of the right, of the left, dictator even. The store shelves are empty. Whoever feeds the country will be good. Representatives of all shades of the political kaleidoscope are proclaiming a single slogan: "We want happiness for the people!" But if you really all want happiness and really for the people, it is permissible to ask left and right, democrat and conservative, potential dictators even: What is it all about, dear comrades? And what is happiness and why do you all have such a different notion of it?

Let us acknowledge that too much of our energy is being dissipated in mutual complaints and political stunts in the eyes of a dumbfounded public. Left and right have become so carried away with themselves and their struggle that they have failed to notice how people have begun to lose interest in them, left and right. Something has changed in our perception of certain personalities, whom even recently we sincerely respected and tried to stick up for.

It is offensive that belief in democracy is wittingly or unwittingly being undermined by the democrats themselves. Although this very concept has somehow been eroded, it has to be confessed. Who are they? More often than not our democrats are former members of the CPSU. There are undoubtedly also "clean" democrats—people with long-standing humanitarian convictions. There are few of these. And what about democracy? What have we in previous years learned about it that is reprehensible for us to be in a hurry to part with it? Why is it not turning out in our country as in other countries? Because we have not yet, most likely, felt deeply that democracy, glasnost, and human rights do not mean slogans in the streets and flag-carrying but something more profound. They mean man himself, his mentality. Slogans, if unsuitable, may, as the people wish, be thrown on the garbage heap of history, and new ones may be devised. Mentality, habits, traditions cannot be thrown out, for all these are within us ourselves.

It is said that nothing sensible will come of our democracy. This path is historically contraindicated for Russia, it is said, and it is preordained a particular fate. I disagree. There are some general conditions that are essential for the control of a sovereign state. These are knowledge, intellect, and culture. This is what we acutely lack as yet.

Let us acknowledge that the democrats have done much that is useful. The drop in their popularity rating is all the more upsetting. But this is, in my view, inevitable. It is not given to everyone to stand the test of time. The people are tired of waiting for a "bright future," and, what is most important, things are not going all that well with us: edicts, orders, coupons, lines.... Both the democrats and conservatives realize that promissory notes of trust some day have to be paid for. Is this not why both have begun to bustle about in the search for a culprit and have been readily prepared to heap their own shortcomings and mistakes on the president's shoulders? And urging, what is more: Step to the left, make a right.... As if more left or more right meant more....

No, we should be saying goodbye not to democracy but to the war of laws, the power struggle, and the persecution of opponents. Harmony and an ability to compromise are needed now more than ever. I, for example, cannot agree with our esteemed prime minister, who believes that it is not the system but people who are to blame. I cannot take on trust the calls for "national salvation" flouting the constitution. And it is as clear as can be to me that a policy aimed at the complete removal from power of the CPSU—the most populous party—is impracticable. We cannot play on people's feelings, pushing them directly or indirectly toward punitive measures.

It has been written and said repeatedly that politics is the art of the possible. And what is possible is well-conceived progress, step by step, along the path of mutual understanding and interaction.

Do we understand this? It does not seem so. Once again I hear and read:

"Boris for king!"—this at a mass meeting.

"Leningrad City Soviet—resign!"—this at another mass meeting.

"The chairman of the Moscow City Soviet Executive Committee is honeymooning in Switzerland, far from the lines and coupons"—this from a newspaper.

Gentlemen, how sick we are of all this! How much more! This is what it is high time we left behind.

## Anti-Leadership Tone at Yeltsin Rally

*PM2602114991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Feb 91 Second Edition p 2*

[TASS report: "Manezhnaya Square Again..."]

[Text] On 24 February, for the third day in a row, Moscow's Manezhnaya Square was filled with people taking part in a rally. At the behest of leaders of the "Democratic Russia" movement, tens of thousands of Muscovites who support the position of B.N. Yeltsin, head of the republic's parliament, as set out by him in a recent TV interview came to the square at midday Sunday.

The speeches of people's deputies at various levels listed the real problems worrying society today and proposed ways to resolve them. The now traditional accusations against the President, the USSR Supreme Soviet, and the

CPSU were voiced. Speakers issued demands to the country's leadership—sometimes constructive but often frankly contrary to the provisions of the Union Constitution.

Unlike the previous day, when a rally was held here on the occasion of USSR Armed Forces Day, this time the Moscow city soviet subcommission for the protection of citizens' rights did not urge Muscovites to keep off the capital's streets and squares for reasons of personal safety.

### Pavlov News Conference on Economic Planning

*PM2602120491 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Feb 91 Union Edition p 1*

[M. Krushinskiy report: "The Plan, the Market, and.... Potatoes—V.S. Pavlov Press Conference"]

[Text] "If I ever experience differences of opinion with the country's president it will be better for me to resign straight away. There is no room for conflict between the premier and the president under presidential rule."

None of the participants in last Friday's press conference had asked V.S. Pavlov about his relations with M.S. Gorbachev. The prime minister issued the above-quoted explanation on his own initiative, obviously sensing the "presence" of this implicit question. On the whole, the press conference proceeded quietly despite being attended by many foreign journalists. I say "despite" because our cabinet leader's recent "press conflict" with Western bankers, who were seriously reproached (via the newspaper TRUD) for attempting to buy up Soviet rubles en masse with the aim of seizing key positions in our economy, is still fresh in many people's memory.

In this connection (naturally the question was bound to arise) V.S. Pavlov said: "My interview was construed as an attack on Western businessmen. But I did not and do not intend to attack them. I have many acquaintances among them, and good acquaintances at that. We favor the development of business links."

Admittedly, it was added that there had nevertheless been "Colombian Mafia" style efforts by Western financial circles to buy hundreds of billions of Soviet rubles. And such efforts continue today. As evidence, V.S. Pavlov even read out a letter which he happened to have on him from one of "them" to one of "us" offering, roughly speaking, to sell a railcar load of Soviet money. I have no grounds to dispute the existence of such dishonest dealings, but I will note that what we are talking about therefore amounts to no more than somebody's (malicious, of course!) intentions. In which case, could we not have been less hasty in exchanging 100-ruble notes, confining ourselves initially to a written statement of intent? Because we all know that it was the flight of billions of rubles across the border which was one of the main reasons for effecting (in reality!) the exchange...

However, that is all in the past. And this was not the main issue discussed at the press conference. Naturally, most of the questions concerned the situation in our national economy and the government's reform plans. The prime minister was at pains to describe in detail his views on the desired correlation of plan and market principles in the economy.

"There has been, is, and will continue to be national economic planning. The entire question concerns the form it will take. Should every last detail be planned so that the national economy comes to resemble a massive industrial plant? Or are we talking only about trend evaluations and expert opinions pertaining to the realization of individual aims?.."

Resolutely supporting the second version of planning, the premier noted that the central organs must pay particular attention to "key areas" which will determine our ability to catch up with the West in the sphere of science and technology.

"There are projects crucial to our development. In various sectors and spheres of activity. Projects that determine the ultimate fate of the development of an entire sector or region. They must be monitored constantly and, so to speak, practically..."

On the whole, the cabinet chief sees the national economy as a "two-tier" system, as it were: The "summit" consists of all-union and republican management organs, and the "base" is inhabited by free and independent producers who are linked horizontally. Meanwhile, the interests of the labor collectives are watched over by trade unions, while the entrepreneurs collaborate to form associations like the well-known Science and Industry Union. And the government stands between them as arbiter, legal guarantor, and setter of the "rules" in the economic "game."

V.S. Pavlov repudiated one foreign journalist's suggestion of a "crisis of perestroyka" which has allegedly been brewing of late.

"It is simply that we frequently try to transfer political ambition onto economic ground. We try to make real life conform to some or other diagram, which leads to tremendous unpleasantness for us."

To support his theory, the government chief pointed to the "mayor of one major city" who announced that as London's mayor was not expected to participate in the potato harvest then neither would he. Such detachment from life's realities resulted in an immediate and sharp increase in the price of potatoes in the stores. Well, everything is possible... However, I will undertake to find examples suggesting the opposite. As V.S. Pavlov failed to state exactly which mayor he had in mind, I too, without naming names, will remind readers of the leader of one major city who could be found in the potato fields near Moscow at the height of last year's toil. Obviously,

there are different types of mayors, and the question of combining reality with desire in the economy is not as simple as it may appear.

Those present in the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center welcomed the prime minister's invitation to make such meetings with representatives from the press a positive tradition. It is not impossible that the next such meeting will be dedicated to the theme of "How We Should Reorganize the State Planning Committee."

### Pavlov Asks To Resign From 'Business World' Chair

*LD2602234691 Moscow TASS in English 2049 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] Moscow February 26 TASS—Valentin Pavlov has requested the board of the "Business World" consortium to relieve him of the duties of the consortium's board chairman in view of his being appointed the prime minister of the USSR, the cabinet's information department announced.

### Dzasokhov Addresses Education Conference

*91US0313A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Feb 91 Second Edition p 5*

[TASS report: "For the Establishment of Humanitarian Traditions"]

[Text] (TASS)—On the initiative of the all-Union "Znaniye" Society, an international meeting of the leaders of educational organizations from 20 countries devoted to the role of humanitarian traditions in the modern world began work on 19 February in Moscow. The meeting was opened by Academician K.V. Frolov, chairman of the all-Union "Znaniye" Society Board.

The participants in the meeting were addressed by A.S. Dzasokhov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee.

The purpose of the international meeting, he observed, is seen as providing an answer to the main question: Do humanitarian traditions, values and priorities have the power and capacity for resolving today's global contradictions, helping the world community defend peace and conquer economic ailments, environmental disasters and national and regional conflicts?

An active process of the return to man of his individual uniqueness and material and spiritual integrity is under way in the country. Today it is the individual who is understood as the measure of our entire reality. The speaker declared that it was time to put into practice K. Marx's idea that "the free development of each is a condition of the free development of all." It is this which is the main humanitarian priority of socialism and the humanitarian essence of the socialist ideal; it is this which is the whole meaning of the restructuring in our country in the sphere of the economy and policy and the social and spiritual spheres.

Despite the difficulties and contradictions of the restructuring processes, a continuous growth of the humanitarian, dominant throughout the domestic and foreign policy of the leadership of the CPSU and the Soviet state, is under way. Processes of the shaping of a state based on the rule of law and the formation of market relations, given a diversity of forms of ownership, democratization and the defense of human rights, are intensifying.

Understanding that science, education, and culture actively influence man's philosophy and perception of the world and his scale of values, morals, and decency, these are becoming priority spheres and are playing a growing part in the spiritual revival of our society. The spiritual life of society needs a firm legislative base, the necessary financing, and an intensification of the processes of democratization and self-management. The first steps on this path have been taken. The edict of the president of the USSR "The Status of the USSR Academy of Sciences" has been adopted.

The speech paid particular attention to problems of international relations and preservation of the Union of SSR. Soviet people and the progressive community have an interest in the Soviet Union holding out, surviving the difficult ordeals and remaining a united, strong state and they are convinced that the Union treaty will make a new start in interethnic relations and duly secure human rights and liberties, A.S. Dzasokhov said.

The essence of our policy is an invitation to cooperation of all who profess freedom, democracy, humanitarian values and the unification of all progressive forces.

At the same time there are attempts on the part of certain state and political circles to interfere in our internal affairs and an endeavor to call in question the USSR's policy of broad cooperation with the international community.

The speech emphasized educational organizations' important role in the development of humanitarian traditions and a strengthening of relations between countries and peoples. The integration of the efforts of national and international organizations of historians, philosophers, economists, psychologists, figures of science, literature and art and ecologists is needed.

A.S. Dzasokhov expressed confidence that the present international meeting of leaders of educational organizations would continue the humanitarian traditions of public diplomacy in the name of peace and mutual understanding.

### Yanayev Meets German Congress Representatives

*LD2702001591 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] Moscow February 26 TASS—On February 25 and 26, Soviet parliament Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov, Vice President Gennadiy Yanayev and Chairman of the

Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet Rafik Nishanov met representatives of the organizing committee for the preparation of a congress of Soviet ethnic Germans.

Organizing committee members told the Soviet officials about the main provisions of the documents subjected for consideration by the congress. They include demands to restore the Soviet German statehood, repeal of repressive acts against Soviet Germans, recognise the status of former members of the labour army and grant ethnic Germans the right to return to localities from which Germans were unfairly evicted during the last war.

Participants in the meeting noted the profound understanding by the Soviet leaders of the complexity of the problem of Soviet ethnic Germans and the need to promptly resolve it. They expressed readiness to facilitate prompt consideration by the Soviet parliament of the annulment of repressive regulatory enactments and by the Soviet Government of the status of labour army members. According to participants in the meeting, the forthcoming congress of Soviet ethnic Germans will yield specific practical results for the long overdue solution of problems, a better reflection of the interests of the German population in the bodies of authority and management and the strengthening of cooperation and mutual understanding among the peoples of our country.

## Yanayev Presents Awards To Space Achievers

*PM2602152391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian*
*25 Feb 91 Union Edition p 1*

[TASS report: "National Awards Presented"]

[Text] Recognition of heroic services to the Soviet people and an outstanding contribution to the process of renewal and perestroyka—that was how USSR Vice President G.I. Yanayev defined the ceremonial act 23 February in the Kremlin's Sverdlov Hall. Cosmonauts, metallurgists, skilled scientists, designers of state-of-the-art equipment, production organizers, and military men were invited to a state award presentation ceremony.

Those receiving the awards included Cosmonaut G.M. Manakov and Test Aquanaut A.I. Vatagin. They were presented with the gold stars of Heroes of the Soviet Union. Orders of Lenin and "Hammer and Sickle" gold stars were awarded to the group of people who developed the multipurpose "Energiya" space rocket transporter system and the "Buran" orbital craft. The awards presented also included Orders of the October Revolution, the Labor Red Banner, and Labor Glory First Class.

The vice president warmly congratulated the award winners and expressed the hope that the lofty awards will fire them with energy for fresh accomplishments in the name of the motherland and the people.

## CPSU's Stroyev Visits Political Base in Orel

*PM2602114591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian*
*25 Feb 91 First Edition p 2*

[TASS report: "Meetings with Orel People"]

[Text] Orel, 24 Feb—Ye.S. Stroyev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, who used to head the oblast Communist Party organization and who has been elected a people's deputy by the oblast's inhabitants, is visiting the Orel region. On 23 February he met with secretaries of the city's party rayon committees, members of the party oblast committee bureau, and leaders of soviet, trade union, and social organizations.

There was a frank discussion on the future of our multinational state and an exchange of opinions on the political and economic situation in the country and the oblast, on the 17 March all-union referendum, and the attitude to it of communists and all inhabitants of Orel Oblast. There was unanimous support for the view that the Orel region's inhabitants will take active part in the referendum and will vote for the preservation of the union state.

On the same day Ye.S. Stroyev visited the collective farm named for the 22d Party Congress, where he met with stockraisers and machine operators and was received by Mikhail and Mariya Podvoiyskiy, who are private farmers.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary will be spending several days in the Orel region.

## Local Deputy Hides 'Insult' To MD Commander

*PM2602165191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian*
*25 Feb 91 Second Edition p 2*

[V. Shalgunov report: "You Can't Swallow What You've Spat Out—Sensation in the Local Press"]

[Text] Samara—At the insistence of Deputy V. Karlov SAMARSKIYE IZVESTIYA, the oblast soviet newspaper, has published the "verbatim text" of his speech at a rally held in the city a month ago. Rather on the late side? But how can that be helped if, in the newspaper's words, "the speech has been subject to distortions in the retelling by some official and unofficial figures."

I read the "verbatim text"—and did not believe my eyes. Because, having been at the rally, I had heard far more than found its way onto the newspaper's pages. I checked it against the tape recording. So that's what it was all about! It turned out that the deputy's fairly lengthy tirade against A. Makashov, commander of Volga-Urals Military District, had been omitted. This tirade, meanwhile, contains the most serious accusations. It appears that the general "was preparing the invasion of Kuwait... and there is blood on his hands!" Further on it gets even more trenchant. "There is no place on Samaran soil for criminals like Makashov; we have never had fascists

here." And so forth in the same vein, greeted by the cheers of some of those attending the rally.

So how come the publication's highly selective "verbatim report"? The explanation is simple. USSR People's Deputy A. Makashov sued Oblast Soviet Deputy V. Karlov, regarding his speech as a shameless lie and an insult to the district officers and commander. So V. Karlov is trying to soften up public opinion on the eve of the judicial examination.

I will not analyze the stances of the two deputies. Each of them is free to hold and to defend his own convictions. But the battle should be honorable, and ethical standards are sacred. There is a Russian saying: "Once you've spat you can't swallow it down again." How much more difficult to swallow a flamboyant little rally speech, aimed at creating a sensation and rapidly snowballing in our confused society via the most ridiculous rumors.

### Poll Shows Support for CPSU

*LD2602223491 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] Despite the political and economic crisis in this country, the Soviet Communist Party has managed to rally and consolidate its ranks.

This was shown by the returns of a poll conducted among communists in different regions of the country. Seventy-four percent of them have pledged their firm resolve to remain in the party and to support its course for perestroyka and democratization of the political system.

The Communist Party now has about 17 million members and is the most influential force in the country. Most respondents in the poll felt that the party can take society out of the crisis. Only 12 percent of them said they intend to leave the party.

## Economic

### OECD Says USSR No Longer 'Good Risk'

*AU2702083291 Paris AFP in English 0028 GMT 27 Feb 91*

[Jan Kristiansen report]

[Text] Paris, Feb 27 (AFP) — The Soviet Union has entered a severe recession which could deepen this year amid growing pressure on its external finances, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) said in a survey released here Wednesday [27 February].

It said the sharp downturn in growth was accompanied by increasing imbalances in the domestic economy, a sharp worsening of the external position over the past two years, and net foreign debt more than doubling from end-1986 to over 43 billion dollars by mid- 1990.

OECD analysts stressed that this "extraordinarily rapid rise" followed decades of "extremely conservative" Soviet external borrowing policies.

With its very high levels of convertible currency deposits with Western banks, and massive non-monetary gold stocks as a secondary reserve asset, commercial banks considered the USSR as a good risk throughout most of the 1980's.

However, the analysts said, as bankers became aware of increasingly "chaotic economic conditions" in the Soviet Union and a build-up of arrears that by some estimates peaked at between five and six billion dollars by mid-1990, Western private institutions hurried to reduce their exposure.

The OECD study said the Soviet Union remains a "moderately indebted" country by most measures, and would not be facing "serious financial difficulties" if growing debt was the only problem.

One basic issue was "a virtual collapse of central control over international payments" which had slipped badly over the past two years.

A seven billion dollar jump in short-term trade-related credits accounted for most of a nine billion dollar 1989 rise in gross Soviet debt to 54 billion, and helped create "extreme liquidity pressures" on the USSR, the study said.

It said that "for all practical purposes, the Soviet Union is no longer able to raise funds in the syndicated eurocurrency or external bond markets."

Its borrowings in these markets fell back sharply from 2.6 billion dollars in 1989 to just over 300 million last year, as foreign banks further worsened the liquidity squeeze by taking out sizeable amounts of credits and deposits.

The OECD study said Soviet output, based on official data, may have fallen by four per cent last year and could decline by another five per cent in 1991.

The study said investment was believed to have declined by over 20 per cent last year while private consumption grew by an estimated three per cent.

However, it said, "these figures may understate the real dimension of the recession by a wide margin."

The OECD said the USSR's hard currency trade surplus disappeared in 1989 and turned into an estimated deficit of some seven billion dollars last year, mainly because of a fall in Soviet oil exports.

Predicting a sizeable net Soviet borrowing requirement this year, OECD analysts recalled that a study of the Soviet economy commissioned by last year's Houston summit of seven Western economic powers recommended that official Western lending to help the USSR finance its payments deficit should be considered only in

the context of a "major and comprehensive" Soviet economic reform programme.

### New Details on Ekho Deal Disclosed

*91UF0511A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 21 Feb 91 First Edition p 2*

[Article by Yu. Nikolayev: "Another 300 Billion"]

[Text] Let me recall: Originally, 140 billion rubles [R] were at issue in our discussion of the "deal of the century," and at present as many as... 440 billion are. There is no mistake here, 300 billion have been added for a reason. The point is that, as has now become known, the issue of yet another transaction, which was scheduled to be consummated, was touched upon at a closed-door meeting of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet which SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA reported on 19 February.

A memo by a commission of deputies reads: **"In December 1990, the RSFSR Council of Ministers prepared a general agreement on cooperation between the 'RSFSR Government' and the 'U.S. financial group, LTD, GmbH' [as published] 'New Republic' on joint investment activities, with a credit line of R300 billion and $50 billion being extended by 'New Republic.'"** It was also noted that "in fact, Chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers I.S. Silayev facilitated the implementation of an economic concept involving the mutual provision of credit by Soviet and Western partners. In particular, the following testifies to it. A letter by I.S. Silayev to B.N. Yeltsin is available containing a request to be granted powers necessary to conclude pertinent agreements."

As we can see, it was said laconically, and it is hard to deduce from the memo what the nature of the planned extensive operation was. I.S. Silayev who spoke at the same meeting did not clear things up either. He admitted that indeed there was an offer by the so- called "New Republic" to import to our country $50 billion-worth of products, sell them along the same guidelines as in the R140-billion contract, and invest the proceeds in our production facilities. However, the government allegedly turned down this lucrative offer as soon as it received information that partners "from the other side" were not solvent. That was all!

What was said suggested that it is not necessary to revisit the agreement that was not. Apparently, the Supreme Soviet was quite satisfied with this explanation. However, it appears to me that it is premature to consider the matter closed. Here is why. This has to do with "the implementation of an economic concept," that is, an entire system (this was noted very definitively by the commission of deputies as well) rather than some one-time attempt to establish mutually advantageous relations with foreign partners. Despite I.S. Silayev calling the story involving the aforementioned document an episode of internal correspondence in the house on Krasnopresnenskaya Embankment, we think that we, along with all Russians, are entitled to know how R300 billion in our hard-earned money was supposed to be earmarked and for what, all the more so because the exceedingly simplified interpretation of the attempt made caused a protest on the part of many employees of the RSFSR Council of Ministers apparatus who sent an entire stack of very interesting documents to our editorial office, including the xerox copy of a letter from I.S. Silayev to B.N. Yeltsin dated 11 December 1990. Here it is.

*"To Chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Comrade B.N. Yeltsin*

*"Esteemed Boris Nikolayevich,*

*"This is to inform you that the U.S. financial group 'New Republic' has approached the RSFSR Council of Ministers with a set of proposals regarding the emergency saturation of the consumer market and development of the economy of the Russian Republic. The draft envisages the provision of funds by the foreign partner in the amount of U.S. $50 billion in the course of 1991 (including $5 billion immediately) to be used for purchasing consumer goods, foodstuffs, medicines, industrial equipment and technology.*

*"With a view to recouping the funds provided, the foreign partner proposes to export products manufactured with the use of the equipment and technologies imported, as well as raw and other materials. In the process, settlements will be made in rubles, with inflator coefficients no higher than three, in a special account at the RSFSR Bank for Foreign Trade. With a view to speeding up the turnaround of funds, the foreign partner requests that a line of credit in the amount of R300 billion be opened for five years (including R140 billion immediately) for investing in the economy of the RSFSR and purchasing raw and other materials. Taking into account the gradual nature of use of the credit line, I believe that it is possible to provide the credit indicated from the funds of the RSFSR state budget.*

*"I believe that it is feasible to set up an independent joint-stock organization in the RSFSR for implementing the proposed draft. The government of the Russian Federation will contribute 25 percent of its capital for control and coordinating functions. An agreement in principle with the foreign partner on the above issues has been secured.*

*"I ask your consent to grant me necessary powers for concluding pertinent agreements.*

*"Enclosures:*

*"1. General agreement on cooperation.*

*"2. Protocol on financial and commercial regulation.*

"[Signed]*Chairman of RSFSR Council of Ministers I.S. SILAYEV*"

I think that anyone reading these lines will agree that this letter to the chairman needs to be read very thoroughly.

I suggest that the readers ponder some "details" on their own, for example, how advantageous the exchange of rubles into dollars is. To this end, I would ask you to note the words and numbers given parenthetically: "including U.S. $5 billion immediately," and "including R140 billion immediately." Just a trifle remains—to divide 140 billion by 5 billion, and you will arrive at an exchange rate that is fabulously advantageous... for the foreign partner. Sure it is! After all, the foreign partner will receive R28 for every dollar. This is the price at which the RSFSR Council of Ministers proposed to achieve "emergency saturation" of the consumer market and "develop" the Russian economy.

Naturally, the following question arises: What is the U.S. financial group "New Republic" that has dollar resources of this size available? I quote a segment of the first line of the General Cooperation Agreement (the word "draft" does not appear in the document). "The Council of Ministers of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, henceforth referred to as 'the RSFSR Government,' on the one hand, and the U.S. financial group, LTD, GmbH,' henceforth referred to as 'New Republic,' on the other hand..." So far, it has been unclear who is behind these abbreviations. Let us try to figure it out. Let us turn to the origins of the General Agreement.

It was initiated by a letter from the "presidents" of two companies—Magne Endahl from Bios Trade and V.P. Vakula from Baltijas Kronis—to G.I. Filshin, deputy chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers. The former company was supposedly registered in Norway, and the second was registered "in the Republic of Latvia" on 13 August 1990. The readers are entitled to ask what "a U.S. financial group" has got to do with it. I really do not know.

As far as the Norwegian "businessman" is concerned, I may say with confidence that no American bankers empowered him to represent "a U.S. financial group." The supposition remains that perhaps the Americans transferred the first $5 billion to the account of the new-fangled "company" in Latvia. This, however, is highly unlikely.

To be sure, in the Protocol of Financial and Commercial Regulations for the General Agreement (once again, the word "draft" does not appear) a "Mr. Leo Emil Vanta, general director of the company 'New Republic'" appears. Is this because his name and surname sound "more American?" A little brokerage company headed by him is registered in... Vienna.

At the very least, we need to meet the cast of characters to make the picture complete. This is how the Norwegian newspaper BUDSTIKA described the president of Bios Trade (subsequently Infos A/S) the way he was before his voyages to the Soviet Union. "Being absolutely without means, without an income, but with a debt of 40 million kroner, Magne Endahl was fighting for his further financial survival, for life."

Leo Emil Vanta appears to be somewhat more reliable. After all, if the commercial register of Austria is to be believed, "a financial group LTD—limited-responsibility company—with the base capital of U.S. $500,000, of which one-half in cash" is behind him.

It was with these "gentlemen of fortune" and pursuers of happiness "with limited responsibility" that the government of Russia began to engage in business worth R300 billion. This boggles my mind! The more you read the documents, the stronger your feeling is that you are being drawn into some vile farce with nonsensical sets and cartoon characters. The amounts that they operate with are beyond even the wildest imaginations. I cannot help recalling lines from a letter by Professor Ye.K. Iordanishvili of the State Technical University of Leningrad. He calculated that if we pile up R140 billion in R100 bills their height will amount to... 280 kilometers! What about R300 billion? It appears that even our glorified cosmonauts have not gone that high....

However, it was no joke when I.S. Silayev wrote a letter to B.N. Yeltsin and requested that the necessary powers be granted. It is hard to say whether Boris Nikolayevich granted these powers to the prime minister or not. It was merely stated at the closed meeting of the session that this "document was referred to plenipotentiary representative of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Comrade G.E. Burbulis..." Incidentally, they also quoted a statement by Boris Nikolayevich at the 21 January session: "With a view to ensuring the foreign-exchange independence of Russia and stabilizing the consumer market, we may engage in restricted and regulated sales of rubles to foreign investors..."

At the closed meeting of the session, I.S. Silayev maintained that doubts about the solvency and reliability of the partners had prompted his decision to discontinue all mutual relations with them. "The letter (quoted above—editorial note) remained in the apparatus of the Supreme Soviet for three days, and we recalled it. Incidentally, I told both Gennadiy Innokentyevich and Comrade Yaroshenko (minister of foreign economic relations—editorial note) that we should discontinue all mutual relations with this character because he is very suspect and, perhaps, a con artist. This is how this affair came to an end."

Several days ago, G.I. Filshin outlined a different version.

He maintained: "I would like to say that this contract has been signed on behalf of the U.S. financial group. It has not been signed by our side because it has not yet been approved by the Supreme Soviet..."

This version is also bolstered by the fact that the Council of Ministers nonetheless continued to comply with the "unsigned" agreement. A special industrial and finance company, Rus, was being created for this purpose. I cannot yet bring myself to write it, but there is nothing

we can do about it: They wanted to camouflage the "credit line" of a highly dubious nature with the sacred name.

It is revealing how the head of the Russian Government and his deputy contradict each other and it is not a pleasant occupation. Besides, discrepancies in their explanations are not the point. Something else is frightening: As a proverb says, the Russian Government waded in unknown waters. They obviously began to take an interest in the personal profiles of the initiators of the planned R300-billion transaction, their competence, and financial solvency in retrospect, after all hell broke loose. What other reason was there for I.S. Silayev and B.N. Yeltsin to start their "internal correspondence?"

The fact that the government has learned nothing at all from the December failure is even more frightening and pernicious for Russia. The government continued to cling to its inferior "concept" with persistence worthy of a better cause. As fate would have it, G.I. Filshin signed off on his infamous letter precisely one month to the day later. The letter was immediately followed by the conclusion, the sale of R140 billion for a ridiculously small amount of hard currency.

A statement by B.N. Yeltsin on the first TV channel the day before yesterday especially puts us on our guard. He made it look as though the KGB needed to compromise the Russian leaders, and the Chekists unearthed "the case of 140 billion." Tomorrow they will produce from their safes yet another such case. This begs the following question: How many more Russian billions have been sold or are intended to be sold for peanuts? What other con artists have the Russian officials contacted in their search for a back door to world civilization?

If B.N. Yeltsin is aware of this he should tell the people and clarify this thoroughly. What if he is not? In this case, we, the Soviet people, are entitled to demand that the USSR Committee for State Security promptly release to the public uncovered instances of pilferage, obvious plunder of our national treasure, and affronts to our national dignity, instead of accumulating in its files "compromising materials" of this nature concerning the Russian leaders. How else? They are toying with the fate of everyone of us, the citizens of the Russian Federation, too flippantly and thoughtlessly.

For some reason, the leaders of the Supreme Soviet, the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and the mass media controlled by them interpret the mounting scandal on account of the shameful deals with astronomical sums as a massive offensive "against democratic forces," "against the democratic Russian Government," and avoid a serious, strict analysis of what has happened in every way possible. They are striving at any cost to present the unprecedented shady transactions with homegrown and foreign con artists as "a standoff" of different social groups or some "confrontation." As I have already written, I quite deliberately did not want to engage in a political discussion. Figuring out the emerging arrangements for robbing the peoples of the Russian Federation and motives driving the initiators of stunning contracts appeared to be much more important. However, I am now aware that political assessments cannot be avoided.

First of all, I would like to recall that, translated from Greek, **democracy** means, after all, **people's power, i.e., a form of state-political organization of society that is based on recognizing the people to be the source of power, on the principles of equality and liberty.** Pardon me, what kind of democracy is it if the fruits of the labor of entire generations are disposed of for peanuts, on the sly, behind the backs of the people? When one, two, or three leaders can make decisions on wholesale and retail sales to the West of sums that exceed considerably the annual volume of the national income of Russia? These arrangements have more to do with **a dictatorship** than they do with **democracy,** no matter how you slice it and no matter how the very possibility of such arrangements is embellished by pronouncements on their concern for the good of the people. It is high time to call a spade a spade.

Even if no other similar steps have been taken, apart from the two mentioned attempts at speculation, we are entitled to raise the issue of virtually premeditated economic sabotage. Moreover, all signs suggest that a tremendous, thoroughly coordinated effort to forcibly change the constitutional system is proceeding behind the artificially stoked fears of a "right" or "military coup," and intimidation with "conservative forces" regaining power.

I understand the entire gravity of the words written and my personal responsibility for them. This is why I will try to explain precisely what prompted me to draw such conclusions.

Only a blind man will fail to see an obvious connection in terms of time, nature, and conceptual foundation between such phenomena as the infamous "500 days" program, fraternization with separatists at home and with shadow economy dealers and racists abroad, the development of a draft new constitution, laws, and draft laws on property, on the privatization of anything and everything, and these vigorous attempts to gain possession of "billions in rubles and dollars." All of these are links in the same chain. Let us not analyze them in detail individually; let us go back to the topic of our conversation.

Let us consider a specific example of what is concealed behind the persistently propagated "reinvestment" in, supposedly, the Russian economy, of funds that were supposed to be generated by the sale of foodstuffs and goods with the dollars acquired at sky-high prices. First of all, we need to keep in mind the fact that the foreign company owning hard currency secures immediate and monopolistic access to our "movable estate" and "real estate." Here are calculations by a qualified specialist. "Oil will definitely account for a substantial segment of counterdeliveries to foreign partners. At present, the

domestic price of oil comes to R70 per ton, whereas in the world market this ton is worth as much as $120 to $130. Therefore, if for starters some 'New Republic,' or 'Dove Trading International,' notifies its Russian 'partner' that it has deposited in his account at a Western bank $1 million, the former will gain access to R18 million (or R28 million!) in the land of Russia. Approximately 260,000 tons of oil may be purchased with R18 million that will later be resold in the West at a minimum of $30 million. Out of this amount, $1 million will offset the initial outlay (if it has indeed been incurred). The remainder of the proceeds will constitute private income and will be put to use. That is, the foreign company will get 30-fold profits on every million or billion it invests (at the 1:18 exchange rate). Such 'business' is without precedent in world trade." Understandably, the take is going to be even greater given the 1:28 exchange rate.

Truly boundless opportunities for stripping Russia naked in a wholesale manner are presented by real estate and land transactions, especially if we take into account that the cost of fixed assets in our country is well under average world prices. However, the Russian leaders do not conceal it. I.S. Silayev's signature is found on a document that says black on white: "To authorize foreign companies to sell goods and services in the RSFSR territory without middlemen for rubles, with the subsequent reinvestment of the proceeds in building their own enterprises..."

Advocates of the deals going into billions paint a colorful picture of how the dollars are going to work, and bashfully keep silent about the destructive potential of Soviet rubles accumulated in our banks. Meanwhile, we should take a hard look at these billions as well...

In summation, I would like to say the following. If our democrats claim responsibility for all this adventurism, for attempts to reduce the Russian Federation to the condition of a run-of-the-mill colony of mafia gentlemen, gibbinses, endahls, [lower case as published] and their Russian patrons under the flag of some 'New Republic,' our democrats should be held accountable with all due severity.

## Delivery Problems Stop Industrial Production

*PM2702140191*

[Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 February 1991 Union Edition carries on page one under the headline "Shops Stand Idle—There Will Be No Goods" a feature which includes reports from correspondents in various cities on industrial stoppages caused by the breakdown in deliveries followed by a commentary by observer V. Romanyuk. The first report, from Moscow, by Yu. Perov reads:

"An extremely tense situation has taken shape at a number of Moscow enterprises because of the delayed solution of the question of asserting new wholesale and retail prices for finished output. Some collectives, which have worked stably and with great efficiency for many years, have found themselves in the position of bankrupts and have been obliged to wind up production and cut back the number of workers. Among them one can name enterprises known throughout the country such as the 'Trekhgornaya manufaktura' combine, the Petr Alekseyev thin-cloth factory, the 'Krasnaya Zarya' knitwear production association, the 'Salyut' sewn goods association, and others.

"Or take another example. Right now hundreds of thousands of third-generation color television sets have accumulated at the depots of the 'Temp' and 'Tubin' production associations and at wholesale trade bases. Because of protracted disputes between the union organs and the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers regarding the setting of retail prices for these television sets to ensure profitable work for the enterprises, to this day they have not gone on sale. Immobilized assets worth many millions of rubles are lying around and the associations' labor collectives are incurring substantial financial losses."

Reports from Ivanovo, Chita, Voronezh, and Kursk describe similar situations there. The feature concludes with the following comment by V. Romanyuk:

"The chronic idling and even stoppages of production facilities in light industry is the finale of a process which began long ago. The empty shelves of the stores reflect not only the flurry of demand or the 'discharge' of excess money into the sphere of circulation. Back when cooperatives for the production of consumer goods started to be created and they began to earn quite good money, people from the state sector were drawn into the cooperative movement. Later, when interregional ties began to burst, light industry was the first to feel the aggravation of the raw material problem. Our dependence on imported raw material also had an effect here (there was no currency and deliveries of raw material, particularly chemical yarns, dyes, and materials for sneakers dried up).

"The breakdown of economic ties about which we are now making such a loud noise only completed the matter. When import purchases were reduced the answer would have seemed to be to develop our own production. But poorly thought out attempts to implement structural perestroyka in the economy undermined the sectors which feed the 'B' group. Initially this affected components but in January 1991 there was an obvious decline in the production of finished products: Some 16 percent fewer chemical fibers and yarns were produced than in January 1990. Moreover, by a chain reaction there was a breakdown in the following production spheres: In January nine percent fewer textiles, 17 percent fewer knitted articles, and seven percent less footwear were produced than a year earlier.

"As a whole the production of cultural and consumer goods still retains the inertia of last year's acceleration: In January the increase in the production of color

television sets, washing machines, and tape recorders was four percent, the increase in vacuum cleaners was seven percent, and the increase in motor cycles two percent. But in the very near future, when the carry-over stocks of subassemblies have been taken, we can expect a decline here. And for several articles there has already been a decline: In January nine percent fewer electric irons, six percent fewer school exercise books, and six percent fewer matches were produced than a year earlier while the situation with regard to regular and Russian-style cigarettes is not improving—seven percent fewer were produced than in January 1990.

"In their reports IZVESTIYA correspondents cite cite numerous instances of the breakdown of deliveries under contracts which have been concluded. In January, V. Tolkushkin deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, said, every fifth light industry enterprise disrupted contract deliveries. In all that meant 326 million rubles [R] of articles not delivered to consumers, including R152 millions worth from the 'Rostekstil' concern. Incidentally, unpleasant prospects await us this year. As of 28 January 1991 only 75 percent of the year's programs had been drawn up in the form of concluded delivery contracts. And that is not the result of poor discipline but the lack of certainty in the provision of raw material for production. We shall cite one more figure: As of 15 January the volume of concluded contracts for purchases of raw cotton was eight percent of the actual volumes of last year's purchases.

In a certain sense statistics reflect the realities of the times. For the first time accountability is being introduced for enterprises' stoppages in connection with the precariousness of their provision with material resources and also for ecological reasons. These will be sad and alarming statistics.

## Agricultural

### Pavlov Chairs Cabinet Session on Farming

*PM2602130991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Feb 91 Union Edition p 2*

[TASS report: "At the USSR Cabinet of Ministers"]

[Text] Specific questions of the preparations for spring field work have been examined at a session of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

Decisions were adopted which oblige the USSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply, the USSR Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of the Chemical and Petroleum Refining Industry, and other ministries and departments producing material and technical means for the countryside to accelerate in every possible way the delivery of spare parts and soil-cultivation, sowing, and other equipment and to organize additional production of certain kinds of agricultural machinery and equipment. Specific measures were outlined to create the stocks of motor fuel and oils needed to carry out the whole volume of spring field work, which is increasing substantially in connection with the special features of the current agricultural year.

One of the most acute and urgent questions was examined—the delivery of polyethylene film to farms for the production of early vegetables. It is proposed to allocate to the countryside in the first quarter of this year twice as much as previously planned. Measures were also defined to provide agriculture with chemical plant protection agents, and rigid deadlines were indicated for their realization.

Republic organs of management were recommended to accelerate the resolution of all questions within their competence associated with the preparation of farms for the spring. This concerns, above all, the repair of equipment and the supply of high-quality grain crop seed and seed potatoes to collective, state, and peasant farms.

Questions of assisting the countryside during the most strenuous periods of agricultural work were also discussed at the USSR Cabinet of Ministers session. The reality is such that many farms still cannot cope independently with the entire volume of agricultural work without the participation of the urban population. A resolution was adopted which defines the procedure for city dwellers to participate in harvest and other agricultural work. Collective and state farms must conclude corresponding contracts with enterprises and educational institutions before 1 April 1991. The contracts must provide for working, living, and pay conditions, including pay in kind. Local soviet executive committees were recommended to release pupils and students from payment of income tax on earnings from seasonal agricultural work.

The USSR Cabinet of Ministers will constantly monitor the decisions adopted.

The session was chaired by USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov.

### Allows Trading Merchandise for Grain

*PM2602141991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Feb 91 Union Edition p 2*

[TASS report: "Vehicles and Currency to Grain Suppliers"]

[Text] For the purposes of realizing the program of urgent measures approved by the USSR president to improve the food situation in 1991, satisfying the population's requirement for grain, groats, and bread, flour, and pasta products, and ensuring a steady supply of mixed feed to poultry factories and livestock-raising complexes, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers has adopted a decision on the additional purchase of 1990 harvest grain for state resources from kolkhozes [collective farms], sovkhozes [state farms], other enterprises, and also citizens in the first quarter of 1991.

To encourage these purchases, the USSR Government has allocated automobiles, trucks, tractors of the Minsk Tractor Plant type, buses, excavators, graders, crane trucks, rolled ferrous metals, pipes, and cement.

Kolkhozes and sovkhozes may acquire automobiles, other equipment, and construction materials regardless of the results of the fulfillment of forward contracts during 1990. For this they must sell grain to local grain reception enterprises and obtain a document granting the right to obtain material and technical means from the nearest base in the USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] system.

Normatives have been defined for the sale of grain per unit of resources. It is necessary to sell 500 tonnes of grain in order to secure the right to buy a Volga GAZ-2410 automobile out of turn, 400 tonnes for a Moskvich-2141, 300 tonnes for a UAZ-31512, 400 tonnes for a bus, 500 tonnes for a crane truck, 300 tonnes for an excavator, 350 tonnes for a truck, 250 tonnes for a tractor, and 600 tonnes of grain for a grader. It is necessary to sell six tonnes of grain to buy one tonne of cement, five tonnes of grain for one of rolled metal, and six tonnes of grain for one of steel pipes.

Grain product associations which have ensured the purchase for state resources of the volume of grain laid down in the contract in accordance with the approved normatives and which have dispatched it in accordance with the orders of the State Commission on Food and Purchases are allocated a Volga GAZ-2410 automobile at retail prices by way of an incentive.

The delivery of material and technical means is guaranteed right after the surrender of grain to the state. For this the Agrosnab [expansion unknown] and the USSR Gossnab's "Soyuzmashzapchast" All-Union Association, on behalf of the State Commission on Food and Purchases, directly conclude contracts with supplying plants for the entire allocated volume of resources and, by agreement with republic, kray, and oblast agrosnabs, define the places for delivery of material and technical means close to regions of grain purchases.

The USSR Cabinet of Ministers decision also provides for the purchase of grain for state resources from kolkhozes and sovkhozes for freely convertible currency with payment at the current exchange rate for the foreign currency ruble. The procedure for making transactions and registering the issue of currency to farms for the grain sold by them has been considerably simplified.

Earlier a decision was adopted on the additional purchase of grain by consumer cooperative organizations by means of countersales of consumer goods. Kolkhozes and sovkhozes can acquire Soviet-made and imported automobiles, motorcycles, refrigerators, television sets, washing machines, and sewing machines to provide incentives for kolkhoz members and sovkhoz workers, and they can also be acquired directly by agricultural workers for the sale to the state of grain obtained as payment in kind for labor. Data on the normatives for grain sales per unit of consumer goods can be obtained from rayon consumer cooperative organs.

## Scientific

### Cosmos 2135 Launched Successfully 26 Feb

*LD2602180691 Moscow TASS in English 1738 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] Moscow February 26 TASS—Yet another satellite in the Cosmos series, the Cosmos 2135, was launched by a Cosmos booster rocket in the Soviet Union today.

The satellite carries scientific equipment to continue space research, as well as a radio system for the precision measurement of orbit elements and a radio telemetric system to transmit back to earth the data on the operation of instruments and scientific equipment. The onboard equipment is functioning normally.

### Cosmonauts Study Heat-Mass Exchange

*LD2202133191 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 22 Feb 91*

[Text] Viktor Afanasyev's and Musa Manarov's space flight is continuing. The Flight Control Center reports that the last two days of the working week on board the Mir complex have been devoted to research within the framework of a program for space studies of materials. The crew carried out a series of experiments on the Peon installation to study the effect of alternating dynamic loads, generated by the operating equipment at the complex, on the processes of heat-mass exchange in model liquids. Simultaneously, the testing of structural elements making it possible to diminish the effect of these factors on the quality of semiconductive materials developed in weightlessness is being carried out. It is a very complex program.

The flight proceeds in accordance with the schedule; the cosmonauts feel fine.

### Two Britons Resume Cosmonaut Training

*LD2602235691 Moscow TASS in English 1827 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Rena Kuznetsova]

[Text] Moscow February 26 TASS—After a short interval, two Britons—Helen Sharman and Timothy Mace—today resumed their pre-launch training at the cosmonauts training centre near Moscow.

Last week they were in London where it was finally decided that Sharman would train among the first crew and Mace among in the second one.

The lift-off is scheduled for May 12, this year. The trainees now have a busy schedule practicing the flight programme on the Soyuz-T spaceship training facility.

handling most diverse unconventional situations that may arise in space and polishing their knowledge of the Russian language.

## Military

### Defense Minister Yazov Views Pact, Gulf War

*LD2602210291 Moscow World Service in English 1810 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Yazov remarks recorded in Russian fading into English translation]

[Text] [Announcer] The Soviet Defense Minister believes the situation in the Gulf would have taken a different turn if Saddam Husayn had accepted President Mikhail Gorbachev's peace proposal from the start and in full. Marshal Dmitriy Yazov was replying to questions from Radio Moscow's Aleksandr Plevakho when he called attention to the following:

[Yazov] The Iraqi Foreign Minister, Tariq 'Aziz, did not try to understand the situation around Kuwait or his own country. On the contrary, he kept issuing demands, unacceptable demands, as they seem.

[Announcer] The Soviet Defense Minister believes Saddam Husayn pursued time-winning tactics. Saddam staked on destroying all material values of Kuwait and turning it into a desert. As soon as ground operations began they made Saddam's defeat inevitable.

Marshal Yazov confirmed this country's principled position for abiding by the Security Council's resolutions and dismissed the claims of some American publications to compromise the Soviet Union as propaganda clamor. Say what they will, the Soviet Union is giving Iraq neither missiles nor combat equipment of any other kind. All Soviet military advisors, said Marshal Yazov, were taken out of Iraq even before the armed actions in the Gulf zone.

Dmitriy Yazov is fresh from Budapest, where the Political Consultative Committee decided to terminate the Warsaw Treaty's military activity. This was behind the other group of questions he answered:

[Yazov] All the meeting participants agreed to rid the Warsaw Treaty Organization of its military wing. The political mechanism of this treaty is still functioning and it will continue functioning for some time. No one must think that the Budapest decision will produce some kind of vacuum or that this country will lose some of its defence capability.

All troops will be withdrawn from Eastern Europe. First, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Germany and then Poland. These troops will be deployed on Soviet territory. Naturally, this country has enough troops and means for defense. Defence is the only way to protect this country.

[Announcer] The other military alliance to cause questions is NATO. If NATO has no enemy and no alliance to oppose it, what is the North Atlantic Treaty Organization itself for? Marshal Yazov believes the time will come when NATO, too, disappears as a military organization. After all, there is much talk about collective European security and a European home.

The Soviet defense minister concluded his interview with Radio Moscow by saying that at the Budapest meeting Eastern European colleagues expressed a wish to carry on military cooperation, but on a bilateral basis.

### Yazov in Honor Guard at Shkadov Lying in State

*PM2602130991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Feb 91 Second Edition p 6*

[Unattributed TASS report: "Last Farewell"]

[Text] USSR Armed Forces servicemen and Moscow's working people paid their last respects 20 February to Hero of the Soviet Union Army General Ivan Nikolayevich Shkadov, eminent Soviet military leader and participant in the Great Patriotic War.

The Red Banner Hall of the M.V. Frunze Soviet Army Central House, where the deceased lay in state, was decked in black. Many wreaths were laid around the coffin.

The honor guard included Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR defense minister, USSR deputy defense ministers, and military leaders.

A funeral rally was held at the Novodevichye Cemetery, where I.N. Shkadov was buried.

### Moiseyev Reaffirms Army's Mission

*LD2602132791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1113 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] Moscow, 26 Feb (TASS)—Army General Mikhail Moiseyev, USSR first deputy minister of defense and USSR Armed Forces chief of the General Staff, comments in PRAVITELSTVENNYY VESTNIK today on the problems which the Soviet Armed Forces are encountering with the course of changes in society and in the international situation. He opposes the further exacerbation of social relations in the country and condemns "the separatist aspirations of political demagogues", calling the Army a "stabilizing factor." "We believe," he says, "that the force of the Army should not be used to settle conflicts resulting from such a policy."

Touching on the future of the Warsaw Pact and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Eastern European countries and Mongolia, the deputy defense minister says an appraisal of the changes occurring in Europe is only possible from the standpoint of the ideals which have become the basis of Soviet foreign policy, based on the new political thinking. "From these positions, it appears," he notes, "that European security based on

bloc structures has no future and impedes integration processes in economic and humanitarian spheres."

The sorest subject, the general explains, is accommodating troops being withdrawn and providing officers, warrant officers, and members of their families with apartments, hostels, and social and communal facilities in the new areas where they are stationed. To date, the number of servicemen without apartments has already reached 192,000. With the withdrawal of troops that has begun from Germany and the planned withdrawal from Poland, this figure will increase to 250,000. Property and financial matters have not been finally settled.

The chief of the General Staff stresses that the USSR Cabinet of Ministers must hasten drawing up the comprehensive state program for the withdrawal of Soviet troops. Its examination by the USSR Supreme Soviet needs to be accelerated.

General Moiseyev states that the USSR Armed Forces, both now and in the future, will ensure the inviolability of the state borders and halt encroachments on the country's sovereignty. He favors a strong and unified Soviet state.

### MPD Chief Shlyaga Visits Troops in Germany

*PM2202132591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Feb 91 First Edition p 1*

[Unattributed report: "Meetings with Group of Forces Servicemen"]

[Text] Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate [MPD], has spent several days among units of the Western Group of Forces. He familiarized himself with morale and the political situation in military collectives, met with leading command and political personnel of the group of forces and of large strategic formations and units and participated in the work of "roundtables" devoted to urgent problems of military building.

Col. Gen. N.I. Shlyaga addressed a party meeting in a tank regiment which forms part of the Urals-Lvov Volunteer Tank Guards' Division. A report from the party meeting will be published in an issue in the near future.

### Manezhnaya Rally Backs Union, 'Unified' Army

*PM2602113591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Feb 91 Union Edition p 2*

[V. Litovkin report under general heading "Rallies in Manezhnaya Square"]

[Text] The rally in defense of the Soviet Army, about which so much was said so passionately over the past two weeks, has taken place in the capital's Manezhnaya Square. As intended, it passed off in a militarily efficient and organized manner but, unlike what had been predicted, quite calmly. No alternative actions or demonstrations were noticeable in practice. Likewise there were no armed people in the square.

Among the hundreds of thousands of people who gathered—from the Moskva Hotel to the Manezhnaya—not all were officers, in uniform and in civilian clothes. As the rally organizers announced, representatives of the capital's labor collectives, scientific institutes, establishments, and public organizations and war and labor veterans had come to Manezhnaya Square to support appeals in defense of the Army, the renewed Union, and perestroyka.

Military bands played in the square, and verses and songs were heard. The rally participants took a minute's silence to honor the memory of those who died in Afghanistan and in defense of the motherland. The icons and slogans raised above people's heads, which had been made by professionals in the art workshops of military units, staffs, and academies, as well as do-it-yourself ones produced by primitive means at home, expressed a tremendous range of opinions. From the traditional "The Soviet Army Was and Will Be United!" to "Russians and Arabs Have Never Fought Each Other and Have a Common Enemy—Zionism!" and "No to Capitalism in the USSR!" Speeches from the rostrum were also scathing about "mafia groupings" and "shadow capital working purposefully to disrupt the state," and boundless support was expressed for "the only powerful force capable of preventing this—the Soviet Armed Forces!"

An appeal adopted at the rally states, in the name of the servicemen of Moscow Garrison, that they protest against slander of the Army as a reactionary and obedient force opposed to the people—the Army was and will be with the people, is opposed to splitting the armed forces along national territorial lines, and demands that political confrontation not be allowed to escalate into armed confrontation and that its problems be understood in depth.

The rally voted for the preservation of the Union and for unified multinational armed forces as a guarantee of society's stability.

### Varennikov, Others Sign General's Obituary

*PM2602122991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 21 Feb 91 First Edition p 4*

[Obituary of N.I. Stashek]

[Excerpts] Hero of the Soviet Union Retired Lieutenant General Nikolay Ivanovich Stashek, a participant in the Great Patriotic War, has died suddenly. [passage omitted]

In the postwar years N.I. Stashek graduated from the M.V. Frunze Academy and the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Military Academy. He served in the troops and was a chief of staff and division commander.

From 1959 he was department chief, faculty chief, and deputy chief of the M.V. Frunze Military Academy. [passage omitted]

V.I. Varennikov, N.A. Moiseyev, A.V. Betekhtin, M.P. Kolesnikov, V.N. Konchits, Yu.D. Zaytsev, A.S. Gudkov, M.T. Demenkov, V.A. Sapozhinskiy.

## Baltic Republics

### Baltic Leaders Attend Nordic Council Session

*LD2602163291 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1500 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] [First announcer] When the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs issued a warning yesterday—as representatives of Baltic states arrived in Copenhagen—that the Nordic Council should not interfere in USSR internal affairs, Nordic prime ministers declared that the Nordic Council has a right to decide for itself what subject it includes on is agenda. Namely, it had been planned to admonish the Soviet Union seriouIsy at the annual session which started today so that negotiations with the Baltic states on the issue of their independence should start immediately.

Estonia and Latvia are represented at the session by their Supreme Council chairmen and Lithuania is represented by Kuzmickas, deputy chairman of the Supreme Council. Denmark and Iceland have been seeking observer status for the representatives of the Baltic states but Finland and Norway have been against.

[Second announcer] An ETA correspondent informs us that the Baltic council has decided that at the routine session the Baltic states' leaders as non-members will not be given the floor. The chairmen of Baltic states' legislatures may, however, speak tomorrow evening when there will be a Baltic evening. They will also give a news conference on the morning of the same day.

### Danish Premier Receives Delegations

*LD2602124191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 2000 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[Text] The head of the Lithuanian Foreign Ministry's Information Bureau in Copenhagen reports: This morning, a Lithuanian Republic delegation, comprising Bronislovas Kuzmickas and Deputies Emanuelis Zingeris and Albinas Januska, flew into Copenhagen from Riga to participate in the 39th session of the Nordic Council.

Danish Prime Minister Poul Schluter received Bronislovas Kuzmickas, Anatoliy Gorbunovs, and Arnold Ruutel, heads of the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian delegations respectively, today. The conversation included a thorough discussion of the political situation in the Baltic countries and the prospects for relations between the Nordic and Baltic states.

Danish Foreign Minister Uffe Ellemann-Jensen received the Lithuanian delgation at 1300 local time. The guests acquainted [word indistinct] with the present [word indistinct] situation in Lithuania and general [passage indistinct]. They answered Ellemann-Jensen's questions concerning the Lithuanian Republic's readiness for negotiations with the Kremlin and other topics of interest to the minister.

### Paratroopers Break Into Lithuanian TV Tower

*LD2702103491 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 0930 GMT 27 Feb 91*

[Excerpt] Vidas Linkevicius has spoken about on crime in Lithuania. He spoke on the telephone to V. Mikulenas, the officer on duty at the Lithuanian Ministry of Internal Affairs, who said:

[Begin recording] [Mikulenas] An incident happened at about 2100 yesterday. A telephone call was received by the police headquarters of Plunge Rayon from Zilevicius, the officer on duty at the television relay tower in Plunge, in which it was reported that at about 2100 about 20 armed servicemen broke into the tower. They were in paratroopers' uniforms.

They simply searched the premises, and according to the evidence given by the man on duty, they allegedly were looking for weapons, thank God they did not interfere with the television tower equipment and did not damage it.

It must be pointed out that five civilians were among the servicemen; two of them spoke Lithuanian, and one of them had a video camera—he probably wanted to film something.

[Linkevicius] If there were any weapons, they probably would have filmed them.

[Mikulenas] They could have brought the weapons with them. However, having not found anything the servicemen cut the telephone wires and left. [passage omitted] [end recording]

### Lithuania Announces Price Hikes, Compensation

*LD2602211191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1705 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Appeal from the Government of the Lithuanian Republic]

[Text] Dear people of Lithuania. The independent State of Lithuania is proceeding along the difficult course of economic reform. Since the start of the current year, raw materials and other goods we purchase from the Soviet Union have had two-fold and three-fold price increases. A marked increase in food product prices by the Soviet Union is also planned on 11 Mar.

To date, our economy continues to depend on that country. If we fail to employ timely responsive measures, the Lithuanian population will suffer, and irreparable damage will be inflicted upon the economy. As a result of price differences, our limited reserves of goods may suddenly find their way to this neighboring country.

For this reason, the government of Lithuania, seeking to protect the Lithuanian market and to diminish unfounded increases in prices and tarriffs, is forced to allow enterprises producing nonalimentary products to offer their goods at new, increased prices. The state will

limit enterprise profits in order to prevent them from seeking unfounded profit. Tariff costs will also be limited.

Food product prices will also be raised. In compensating your additional expenses, the government has resolved to provide a mandatory R85 supplement per month for those members of the population who are unemployed, who receive pensions, stipends, unemployment compensation, or other payments. Those who are employed are to be accorded sums not less than R105 per month, from which amount R85 constitutes the mandatory portion of the compensation, while R20 is accorded additionally to every employed individual.

The compensation payments have been initiated today, 26 February of this year, and will be received with wages or other payments. The first compensation payment will be received by members of the population by 19 March.

However, compensations alone will not suffice. The enterprises and organizations seeking to realize a profit are permitted to compensate their workers with unlimited wages. According to a governmental decision, wages have already been increased for employees of fiscal organizations.

The government expresses its conviction that the Lithuanian people will support its efforts, and will not depend on those who seek new bloodshed, incite internal disagreements, and spread lies about rural reforms.

That was an appeal by the Lithuanian Government to the people.

## Lithuanian Radio Second Program Returns to Air

*LD2502152091 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[Summary] Viktoras Randakevicius and Kazimiera Malkiniene, coworkers at the Lithuanian Radio and Television complex, say that the main difficulties in setting up the broadcast of Lithuanian radio's second program were more of an organizational nature than a technical nature.

V. Randakevicius says: "There is also a problem of supplying the programs to the international telephone exchange, which then relays our programs to the transmitters of Lithuanian radio throughout the republic." He says that the staff of the international telephone exchange is very helpful in this matter.

K. Malkiniene, head of the program department at Lithuanian radio, says that the first broadcast took place at 0500 GMT on 25 February. Speaking about future programs on the second program, she said that music and religious programs, especially those of the Orthodox Church, would be resumed, as they had been very popular with the listeners before the occupation of the television tower. News bulletins and other information will be broadcast at 1900 GMT and 2130 GMT.

K. Malkiniene said: "As before, the second programme will be broadcast on 271 meters medium wave and ultra-high frequencies." She said that reception in Vilnius can be rather poor, but she believes that the rest of the territory of Lithuania will have normal reception.

Poor reception in Vilnius is due to the transmitters situated in the Vilnius television tower being taken over by the military. They are out of operation. Naturally, the military will not relay the programs of the radio of independent Lithuania. The first program is transmitted from the transmitter in Siskunai near Kaunas.

## Lithuanian Appeals to UN on USSR 'Aggression'

*PM2702123791 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 9 Feb 91 p 2*

[ELTA report: "Appeal to Human Rights Commission"]

[Text] The Lithuanian Association for Human Rights has sent the participants in the 47th session of the UN Human Rights Commission meeting in Geneva a message demanding discussion and condemnation of the mass violations of human rights which have been and are being committed in the course of the USSR aggression against the Baltic peoples. The message, signed on the association's behalf by Chairman Anatanas Buracias, Honorary Chairman Vytautas Petkus, Lithuanian Writers' Union Chairman Vytautas Martinkus, and Lithuanian Academy of Sciences Botanical Institute Director Romas Pakalnis, spells out the methods and means used by organs of USSR executive power, the occupation troops, and ideological departments.

The most savage mass terror, the message states, is being used to attempt to reimpose the compromised Soviet regime on the inhabitants of Lithuania. They are being deprived of rights to objective information following the handover to the Lithuanian branch of the CPSU of the Lithuanian state mass communications media occupied by military force. The message notes the harm caused to Lithuania's natural environment by the USSR's ecological sabotage and the losses incurred by its economy because of the economic blockade.

Lithuanian people's rights, the message states, are most blatantly violated when Lithuanian young men are forced to serve in the USSR Armed Forces and the military attack peaceful civilians, seize the buildings of state and social organizations, and destroy their property.

The message also contains a demand that the session propose to the UN Security Council that an emergency session be convened to discuss the consequences of the aggression and the resultant danger to international security and peace.

### Godmanis Briefs Press on Relations With Center

*LD2602235291 Moscow TASS in English 1757 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Galina Kuchina]

[Text] Riga February 26 TASS—Economic agreements with the centre will enable Latvia to transform its political system and make actual steps towards independence under conditions of greater stability, Latvian Prime Minister Ivars Godmanis said, explaining the objectives of the treaties discussed in Moscow by representatives of the federal and republican governments.

He was speaking at a news conference in the local television studio on Monday evening.

As regards relations with the centre, the head of the Latvian government stressed that the contract signed by the republic to supply some foodstuffs to the federal fund in exchange for equipment, fuel, fodder and sugar was profitable for Latvia.

Discussion is still under way how much Latvia should deduct to the federal budget.

"We shall not pay the asking amount of two billion roubles, we can only discuss something like 400 million,+ Godmanis said.

He agreed that Latvia must contribute the financing of oil extraction and common ecological projects.

The prime minister said that debates continued in Moscow about Latvia's share of the Soviet foreign economic debt. He said he was sure it should amount to no more than 300 million roubles of the total 41 billion roubles.

Godmanis also said that the Latvian leadership would raise the question of Latvia's political status during consultations with the delegation from the Soviet president. It is expected to arrive in Riga in early March.

### Russian Democrats Support Latvian Independence

*LD2602152191 Riga International Service in Latvian 2030 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[Text] The Russian democrats of Latvia are declaring their belief in the idea of Latvia's independence. Yesterday in Riga there was a broad gathering of Russian democratic organizations in Latvia. The purpose of the meeting was to voice attitudes to this measure on the eve of the poll, as well as to coordinate views on other questions. A special resolution was adopted, unequivocally supporting the idea of the poll on 3 March, and urging residents to vote for the democratic independent statehood of Latvia. A resolution was also passed on the more active coordination of the representation of various democratic movements and activities, as well as organizational and party work.

### Deputies Seek Nullification of Latvia Treaty

*LD2602152791 Riga International Service in Latvian 2030 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[Excerpt] It is reported from Moscow that a group of Russian people's deputies have proposed a legislative initiative be put on the agenda that the Russian Supreme Soviet adopt a resolution declaring the interstate treaty between the Republic of Latvia and the Russian Federation as invalid since it was signed on 13 January. It must be added that this agreement has not yet been ratified by the Russian Supreme Soviet, in contrast to the Latvian Supreme Council. [passage omitted]

### 3 March Poll Available to Latvians in Sweden

*LD2602222391 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 0700 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] All permanent residents in the Republic of Latvia who for various reasons are located in Sweden and cannot vote in their own places of permanent residence will be able to take part in the 3 March poll by consultative procedure to express their attitude to the question: Are you in favor of a democratic and sovereign independent Republic of Latvia?

By the same procedure, even Latvians permanently resident in Sweden may take part in the poll. The voting will take place at the Latvian Information Bureau in Stockholm. This is the address: Raadmansgatan 18, Stockholm, zip code 11425, telephone 08-105024.

We kindly ask you to express your attitude by going personally or sending a telegram with your full name, surname and address to the Supreme Council of the Republic of Latvia.

### Riga Militia Headquarters To Be Disbanded

*LD2602200991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0900 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[From the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] The (?DIENA) agency reports from Riga that the headquarters of the voluntary people's militias is to be disbanded. All its resources will be passed to the Public Security Department.

### Radio Rossii Interviews Latvia's Gorbunovs

*LD2402140891 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1115 GMT 24 Feb 91*

[Interview with Latvian Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatolijs Gorbunovs by correspondent Valentina Bochkova; place and date not given—live or recorded]

[Text] [Bochkova] In my opinion, present events force those who previously doubted to give an affirmative answer to this question: Are you for a democratic Latvian Republic with state independence? What do you think, and what do you predict?

[Gorbunovs] I think there are people who doubt. People are concerned by what life will be like in a democratic Latvian Republic in an independent state society. But I think that it becomes immediately apparent what specific questions concern people. We have no problems which this democratic independent state will not be able to solve, not economic problems or interethnic problems.

[Bochkova] What is your attitude to the Committee of National Salvation? This is such a topical question for the Baltic republics, and is now becoming topical for Russia.

[Gorbunovs] I think that this is an unconstitutional path, an illegal path. I simply greatly regret that people chose such a path, and that on the whole this path was chosen by people in the Latvian Communist Party or the CPSU.

[Bochkova] The coming Latvian poll is not a spontaneous phenomenon. It is a reaction to the decision to hold a referendum within the Union. Why does the form of words which the inhabitants of the Soviet Union are to respond to seem to you to be unacceptable?

[Gorbunovs] Well, you see, there are many questions which seem to me [word indistinct] when I touched on this question, and I said this to Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, that considering the historic situation in the Baltic countries, and also today's situation, when many native inhabitants really want a democratic independent state to be resurrected, in this situation to ask another question is not correct especially a question on whether or not to preserve the Union. A more correct question would be or not to enter the new renewed union, without knowing about this renewed union.

[Bochkova] Doesn't it seem to you that people are putting the cart before the horse? That is, we still do not know all aspects of the proposed treaty. We still have to work on certain details, and here we are to bless this union.

[Gorbunovs] From a purely political point of view, I can say that this is a very weak point. When you ask a specific question about what lies at the bottom of a renewed union, about what its newness consists of, how will problems of equal rights and sovereignty be decided in this Union, then the draft Union treaty does not answer these questions.

[Bochkova] You are a very balanced man, a very balanced politician. This was evident in January 1991. I remember those mad days, when the parliament was in session and you proposed adoption of an appeal to the people of Latvia, when we were really living on a powder keg, right? But, doesn't your attitude to the all-Union referendum show a lack of fath in the Union Government's ability to preserve something?

[Gorbunovs] Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin put the question sharply. It is possible to argue about the form in which he put it, but I think no one can disagree that he correctly put this question on the Union itself. How it will develop, and what will be the role of the country's leadership and the country's political leadership? At the moment, the situation is such that the political leadership and the central government want to preserve the Union at any price. But, today, it is already clear that many republics are not even coming close to the Union treaty. It is necessary to ask—why, if everything is so good, if everything has been thought through. In this connection, I stress once more that Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has a definite program. He wants to create meaning in the Union.

Our views coincide in that we really do need to start with an economic agreement. Those who can already conclude a political union can conclude their political union. All this makes sense where the sovereignty of the republics or the status of independent states which have made their declarations are concerned. But, at the moment, this is being pushed from above. Of course, this is not separatism, but logic immediately opposes this.

[Bochkova] You know, in the latest thoughts of Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn published last fall, he wrote that every people, every nation, has its own traditions, its own foundations. Finally, there is an understanding about how it is necessary to build your own state. In man's affairs, there are things which have been laid down over the centuries. What has been laid down about the state system in the affairs of the Latvian people?

[Gorbunovs] I agree with you, of course. Historically, very many people, especially of the older generation, remember the twenties to the forties. This was then an independent state. Of course, there were problems then. Everything was not sunny. Still, it was a prosperous European state. In that state, people think, most importantly there were no interethnic problems. For that reason, I cannot say why it is precisely, but every people which has had its own statehood strives to regain their statehood.

[Bochkova] Speaking frankly, as a Russian, when I heard the interview with Pavlov that last year 234 tons of gold were taken out of Russia, I thought, how would you react if so much was taken out of your republic?

[Gorbunovs] What did this parade of sovereignties begin with? It began with two things. In these declarations of sovereignty, usually, two things are written. First, that the people must own everything, the people who live in one republic or another, moreover not on the basis of nationality, but the actual people. The people must own everything which is there—minerals, land and so on and so forth. That is the first thing.

Second, that the people, through representative in the Supreme Soviets and the highest authorities, must govern their own life. So, these are the two basic points which, in all the republics, concern both the leaders and peoples. For this reason, I see nothing unnatural in Yeltsin asking this, just as I see nothing unnatural that when there was the question of the Union budget, the

first talks were with Russia, on how much Russia puts into the Union budget, because all felt that on the whole it is supported by Russia, and by the other large republics. By Russia, because our one billion, more or less, is not what counts.

[Bochkova] I return to the 234 tons of gold and wonder about how many crippled children there are here, after the Chernobyl accident, and how many times we have heard announcements on radio and television that parents are looking for sponsers in order to find some 50,000 dollars to cure a child. I think that if we were to count 234,000 kilograms, well, let's say a kilogram of gold for every child if he was cured, we would give our children their health back, we would return it to people who could serve their country. It turns out that someone supposedly is concerned about us, handing over our gold, he takes care of us, he buys something, which we do not see, and it turns out that all our good seems to turn out badly.

[Gorbunovs] You know, unfortunately this really does turn out strangely. For it turns out as if the central government takes care of the well-being of all the country's inhabitants, and it cannot be reproached in this, it really does try, but the system is such that the republics themselves are estranged.

In the case of this gold, the republic itself which, as a matter of fact, produces this gold and has the right to expect that it can dispose of this gold, is being pushed aside. This is a viscious circle. But, it will always be like that if we put everything into a common pool and then try to fish something out of it. We will always think that we have been lost our share. Therefore, this system should be changed.

[Bachkova] Latvia, as Russia, thrived at one time, before the period which was named "the dawn of mankind" set in, but now it is, alas, in a very catastrophic situation, on the whole, as Russia is, too, if we draw a parallel. Are you sometimes frustrated when you want to do one thing, but another is foisted upon you, when you try to start restoring your state in one way but you again encounter obstacles? How long can you carry on overcoming this psychological pressure? Do you have enough strength?

[Gorbunovs] You are right. But, unfortunately such is today's situation and we must be optimists, at least a little bit, because this historic process of change is very complicated, and it is a process indeed. It is impossible to carry out reform in a second. Therefore, despite all the complexities, I am optimistic.

[Bachkova] There is an opportunity to address the multimillion Russian audience in this hour, which is hard for the republic and crucial in the life of our neighbors. What can you tell them?

[Gorbunovs] You know, first of all, in Latvia 30 or more percent of our people are Russians. I know many of them through my former work and through my current work. I know many people [passage indistinct] I believe, however, that in this situation, a very complex one, the Russian people will find strength and talents which will lead Russia out of the crisis after all.

### Lithuanian CP's Jermalavicius Interviewed

*PM2702133391 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 12 Feb 91 p 2*

[L. Filipavichene report: "'This Is Just the Beginning of the Calamity...'"]

[Text] The news conference which was attended by leaders of the Lithuanian Communist Party [CP] Central Committee Ideological Department headed by its chief J. Jermalavicius was, as the saying goes, unconstructive. There was not even a hint of understanding, let alone agreement, between the sides. Maybe the journalists were excessively emotional and to a certain extent biased (they themselves had suffered as a result of the actions under discussion), maybe the sides' positions and views were too polarized... Some questions turned into accusations and no longer required an answer, while others, which were repeated several times ("What is the legal ground for the radio, television, and television tower being 'taken under protection', they are not party property, after all?". "How are we to interpret the statement about the change of power which came from a tank on that fateful night outside the television tower?"), simply failed to elicit specific answers.

Following the news conference, we asked J. Jermalavicius several questions, which we offer for your attention.

"In your introductory speech you said that the situation in the republic remains complex. What did you mean?"

"My perception of the situation in Lithuania: Confrontation and tension are growing with the solution of almost all questions, including the question of holding the poll which was described by the USSR president as juridically inconsistent. This is one of latest factors proving the confrontation between the leadership of the republic and the USSR, and it is again placing the people in a difficult situation."

"But the people will probably choose whatever they find acceptable? They do have this right."

"The poll's results are obvious to me right now. The very formulation of the question prompts only an affirmative answer. After all, who is against independence or democracy? Maybe just fascists and totally ignorant people. I personally will not take part in the poll."

"Has the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau expressed its attitude toward the so-called National Salvation Committee?"

"Yes, our party's newspapers published a statement by the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau noting that it supports the committee's activity to the extent that its aim is to restore the operation of the

USSR Constitution on the republic's territory. This was the actually the main task of the committee's activity."

"Do you not think that the Lithuanian Communist Party will be discredited if it emerges that members of the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee headed the National Salvation Committee?"

"It is hard to say. Life will have its own say, seeing that the process is still developing while political tension and confrontation are growing. I personally think that a real way out of this situation is possible via the establishment of presidential rule."

"Does this mean that our question will then become superfluous?"

"..."

"There were several questions today about the statement, broadcast from a tank, about the transition of power into the National Salvation Committee's hands. Do you know who made it and do you consider it legitimate?"

"I have been accused of making this appeal. But I myself have not heard it... That night I was on duty at the Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee. About the statement's legitimacy? This is not the way to take power, power is gained as a result of a revolutionary or counterrevolutionary process. Our present situation, with no power at all and with neither all-Union nor republic laws in force, is a critical situation. It is still hard to say who will take control of the situation, who will manage it in Lithuania."

"Turning to the first question, what is your view of the way out of what you have described as a complex situation?"

"If the growing confrontation and this war of laws lead to civil war in practice...if society is thrown into an armed civil war, which of course depends not on communists but on the overall course of the confrontation, then... nobody knows what will happen then. I think that everything we are living through today is just the start of a major calamity."

This is J. Jermalavicius' opinion.

## Latvian Strike Committee on 16 Jan Explosion

*PM2502100191 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 19 Jan 91 p 3*

["Latvian Republic Strike Committee Statement"—SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA headline]

[Text] On 16 January 1991, within 40-50 minutes of Latvian Republic Council of Ministers Chairman I. Godmanis' speech in which he spoke about blood already shed as a result of the blockade of the city and warned of the possibility of further bloodshed, there was a powerful explosion at the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Sociopolitical Center, which houses the Latvian Republic Strike Committee, the Executive Committee of the United Council of Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Labor Collectives, and the "Equal Rights" faction of the Latvian Supreme Soviet.

In this connection we have noted that an uncontrollable situation is developing in the city of Riga, in which conditions the democratic actions of labor collectives' representatives to defend human rights in the republic are coming under direct pressure.

## Belief Riga 'Returning to Normal' Disputed

*PM2502115391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 18 Feb 91 Second Edition p 2*

[Report by Correspondent O. Meshkov under the "USSR Is Our Common Home" rubric: "If Not Accord, Then What Else?"]

[Excerpt] Riga—[passage omitted] The situation in the republic is at boiling point. And to be honest, it is strange to hear comforting words on Vremya that the situation in Latvia (as in Lithuania) is returning to normal. How, then, is it returning to normal? Because there isn't shooting every day? But how many illegally held arms are there in the republic? Some 650 automatic weapons have been issued to members of unconstitutional formations from Latvian Internal Affairs Ministry arsenals alone. And USSR and Latvian Republic People's Deputy V. Alksnis decided to talk about this for all to hear on the Leningrad Televison program 600 Seconds, which is also broadcast in Latvia. He began: "I have communicated an encrypted message to the USSR president on this question (the sources of supplies of weapons for detachments of unconstitutional Latvian formations—O.M.) which laid out the following..." However, the following did not follow: Transmission of the program to Latvia was immediately suspended.

However, the weapons are in people's hands and they are fired, not every day or night, but they are fired. A. Nevzorov, chief of the 600 Seconds program, was fired at when he went around Riga at night with members of the special-purpose militia unit. This is a "situation returning to normal"?

Shortly after the attack A. Nevzorov said in an interview: "I consider that we should preserve the Union at all costs. We have no other way of saving the life, dignity, and honor of the Russian-speaking population living outside Russia. Otherwise we will be turned into hired hands and slaves and be forbidden to speak Russian." OK, the Leningrad Television reporter has his own vision of and understanding of the problem. Too drastic perhaps. But what makes you treat his "predictions" seriously is that there is a "Citizens' Congress" (also a public formation, after all) in the republic whose banners read "Latvia for the Latvians!" It demands that a law on citizenship be adopted whereby only those who lived here prior to the summer of 1940 or their direct descendants can be Latvian citizens. But that is still not the

worst thing. At the height of the propaganda campaign over the tragedy in Vilnius and to the sound of barricades and other obstructions being erected the Latvian Supreme Soviet took an unprecedented step: It issued a joint communique with this "Citizens' Congress," which was deemed unlawful by the previous convocation of the Supreme Soviet, whose decision has not, incidentally, been rescinded.

The opposition "Equal Rights" faction immediately lodged a protest, quit the parliament building, and has not returned there since, preferring to work on its own. Surely those parliamentarians are right. Can all the resolutions and laws adopted by the remaining parliamentarians in the absence of "Equal Rights," which is backed by voters constituting almost half the inhabitants of the republic, really be regarded as humanly and legally valid?

So how is is possible after this to pin the blame for everything on the All-Latvian Public Salvation Committee, whose sole aim is to protect the rights of people guaranteed by the USSR and Latvian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Constitutions. You may ask whether those violations really are occurring? Yes, they are. A list of violations of the political, economic, and social rights of citizens in Latvia guaranteed by the USSR and Latvian SSR Constitutions and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights has been scrupulously drawn up by the All-Latvian Public Salvation Committee, citing the legal and constitutional articles and paragraphs in question. The list takes up precisely 14 pages of typescript. How many tears, dramas, and humiliations those pages represent...

I am far from being inclined to regard one side as 100-percent right and the aspirations and actions of the opposing side as absolutely misguided. That is not how things happen. After all, a considerable part of the indigenous population of the republic, which has also endured quite a lot of grief, humiliation, and injustice, is on the other side of the barricade. But what does that honest part of the population, which is not susceptible to racist ideas, want? Believe me, as someone who has lived almost all his life in Riga, that they want a peaceful, just, and democratic life. Those people, just like us, are racking their brains in anguish to find a solution, a genuine route to that democratic way of life.

I am sure that the center is also engaged in this anguished exercise of the mind. It sometimes seems to us that they are too irresolute there. But perhaps that is merely the consequence of a desire to preserve at all costs genuine democracy, which we never seem to reach, and prevent its flickering spark being snuffed out by ill winds.

I think that much will be tackled now. At their meeting with M. Gorbachev and A. Lukyanov, Latvian Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Gorbunov and Latvian Communist Party Central Committee First Secretary A. Rubiks came to the decision to set up a conciliatory commission or committee, whose members will be confirmed by the President of the country, and this organization will be required to bring decisions adopted by the republic parliament into line with the USSR Constitution.

However, the problem is that to date only A. Gorbunovs has agreed to this general decision, while the final answer must be given by the whole of parliament. I think that in the current situation the majority in parliament, representing the Latvian People's Front, will scarcely support the idea. Perhaps the members of the official delegation which will be sent to Latvia will manage to erect the necessary scaffolding for the edifice of common accord to be further constructed? After all, judging by the makeup of the delegation, many questions of a political, economic, and military nature are to be tackled in the upcoming talks.

### Ruutel Speaks 24 Feb on Estonian Independence

*LD2602201691 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 0700 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] Today's PAEVALEHT sums up the speech by Arnold Ruutel made at the festive concert on Independence Day [24 February] in the Estonia concert hall.

In his speech the chairman of the Supreme Soviet copnfirms that we are indeed restoring the self-same republic that was created 73 years ago. Arnold Ruutel holds the position that—keeping in mind the principle of juridical succession—one has to preserve the provisions and objectives of the 1938 Constitution as much as possible. Full implementation of these are, however, largely impossible, the chairman of the Supreme Soviet said. For this reason he said that the only possible way is to draw up a new fundamental law, which needs first to be discussed with the population.

The full text of the speech has been published in the RAHVA HAAL.

### Interrepublic 'Consultative Committee' Meets

*PM2602120991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Feb 91 Union Edition p 2*

[Irina Litvinova report under the rubric "Direct Link": "Consultative Committee's Decisions"]

[Text] Riga—A routine session of the Governments' Consultative Committee, created in Tallinn a few months ago, has been held. Participating in it were plenipotentiary representatives from Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, Armenia, Belorussia, Moldova, the Ukraine, and Kyrgyzstan [Kirghizia].

At a news conference Arnis Kalnins, deputy chairman of the Latvian Council of Ministers, told journalists about the decisions adopted by the committee. According to him, the coordination of the republics' legislation and approaches to the decentralization of the country's economy and to integration in the European market were discussed.

The adopted documents were signed not by all the conference participants but only by those who were interested in their adoption and who had been given corresponding powers. A protocol on customs cooperation and regulations governing customs arrangements was signed by the representatives of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia. The document points out that the eastern border is a single customs border for the Baltic republics. Unified tariffs, a unified system of accounting and monitoring imports and exports of commodities, and a unified procedure for declaring goods are being set up in them. A customs tariff will not apply to commodities crossing the eastern border at governmental level, nor to those crossing from the USSR and other foreign countries to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic's Kaliningrad Oblast.

The conference participants proposed to the heads of governments of sovereign republics and to Moscow and Leningrad City Soviets that they appoint permanent representatives to the Governments' Consultative Committee.

### Estonian Speaker Meets With USSR's Laverov

*LD2502150791 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1800 GMT 22 Feb 91*

[Text] Ulo Nugis, speaker of the Republic of Estonia Supreme Soviet, had an unofficial meeting on 22 February with USSR Deputy Prime Minister Nikolay Laverov. According to a USSR president's decree, Laverov heads the USSR delegation for discussions on political, social, and economic issues with the Estonian delegation. The parties agreed to organize a first meeting after the 3 March referendum. It is most likely that the meeting will take place in Tallinn. Even though Nikolay Laverov said that the meeting may turn into negotiations, Ulo Nugis was left with the impression that the USSR is not ready to hold negotiations on the subject of restoring the state independence of the Republic of Estonia, nor does it want to. This is what ETA states.

### Estonian Legislature Debates Tax Issues

*LD2502144491 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Albert Maloveryan]

[Text] Tallinn February 25 TASS—Can the damage done to the Estonian population by the new tax policy be redressed? An answer to this question is expected to be provided by Estonian members of parliament at a session that opened today.

One of the priority documents to be discussed by parliament is the draft law on changes in turnover taxation. When familiarizing themselves with the draft, deputies understood that for a month and a half the government levied double tax on individuals for sales of tobacco, hard liquor and beer. Damage to the population amounted to several million rubles.

The error could have been avoided, if excise on alcohol and tobacco introduced a year ago had been lifted. The parliament is also expected to answer what should be done to protect people from such mistakes in the future.

On the whole, the discussion of the draft and proposals, voiced in the discussion, to investigate the government's unlawful activity testify to a deepening crisis of the executive power in Estonia.

### Estonian Deputies Recall Bill on Pay Raises

*LD2702001191 Moscow TASS in English 1640 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Albert Maloverian]

[Text] Tallinn February 26 TASS—A bagful of small coins was conveyed to the Estonian parliament today. A total of 427 roubles 15 kopecks were donated by students in Tartu for the most needy member of parliament, whom, students said, the parliament speaker was to identify.

This original act of protest was organized in response to last week's discussion in parliament of the bill to raise pay to parliament members to 1200 roubles a month, 2.5 times its present value.

The bill caused protest not only among the general public but also among parliamentarians. After a lengthy debate the bill was recalled by its initiators.

### Government Says Drunks Caused Tallinn Explosion

*PM2602125591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Feb 91 Union Edition p 2*

[Item in roundup of IZVESTIYA, TASS, INTERFAX, and SIBINFORM reports: "Tallinn Explosion Was Hooligans' Prank"]

[Text] The Estonian Government Press Service has circulated a report on an explosion which occurred outside a hospital maternity department in Tallinn during the night of 20-21 February. The report states that, according to Press Service information, this explosion was unconnected "with any political motives and was an act of hooliganism by a number persons in a state of intoxication." The Estonian Government Press Service has asked the mass media not to use this event "for any hasty political conclusions," INTERFAX reports.

### Estonian Separatists Said Stifling Debate

*PM2502143191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 19 Feb 91 First Edition p 2*

[Report by correspondent Captain Third Rank B. Maryukha: "Trial by Confrontation"]

[Text] After the events in Vilnius and Riga, the more radically disposed media predicted a similar fate for Estonia. It could be said that the heightened hysteria

surrounding that "fatal" Sunday in the Baltic region has served its purpose. I was also somewhat oppressed by the hushed, half-empty 'Moscow-Tallinn' train, and the posters on the gates of the deserted "Dvigatel" plant—"Political Strike Under Way"—which greeted me through the car window at the entrance to the city. I felt these same emotions when I listened to the transmission of the republic Supreme Soviet session which adopted a decision not to allow [TV journalist Aleksandr] Nevzorov into Toompea Palace, and when I saw the barricades blocking the road to Palace Square with my own eyes. Looking at the strong young "Kodukaitse" [defense force] guards in brand new light blue uniforms, my attention turned to one seemingly insignificant detail. The defense department emblem is not a shield, but a sword.....

When I met with the strike committee members at their headquarters in the Tallinn Ship Repair Plant, they seemed totally cut off from the outside world. Wearing a bulletproof vest under his work clothes, M. Lysenko, head of the republic strike committee, provided a timely reminder of the recent explosions and threats of physical violence against himself and all who speak out against the chosen policy of taking Estonia out of the Union.

Today it is clear that we have managed to avoid the worst, but in those days and minutes it seemed that a critical build up of confrontation was ready to explode the delicate power balance. There was no explosion and the crisis passed. So what prevented it, or rather, what helped? Of the many reasons, the main one is insight. No small part, probably, was played by Nevzorov's report on Estonia. Hundreds of thousands of people were able to look at themselves objectively and assimilate the facts before them. They were horrified. An awareness emerged of what the word "our" actually means.

Just two or three years ago, everybody here was "ours." Today everything has changed. And now this distinction between "ours" and "theirs," which seems to have become the norm in an incessant stream of mutual reproaches and ultimatums, has, at the last minute when bloodshed seemed imminent, delivered a sobering blow.

So whose plans were foiled? Today, many people in Estonia are asking this question. Those of the center, perhaps, which, being pulled from all sides by republican sovereignties, has run up against stubborn resistance and harsh criticism on every issue and is barely managing to defend itself from just and unjust reproaches. But after the events in neighboring republics, is it likely that the center would seek further conflict? Would it not be more accurate to look for interested parties in Estonia itself from among those eager to realize ambitious plans at any price? And to score points in the way Landsbergis did today—the only person to draw political advantage from the recent tragedy. I think it appropriate to note here how the idea of an Estonian separatist movement, which had been gathering momentum, has recently begun to fade in the republic, or at the very least to move over to a channel of constructive dialogue with differently minded people. This process was reinforced by the economic shortcomings of E. Savisaar's government, which led to soaring prices and empty stores. It turned out that many new legislative acts hit not only the Russian-speaking population but also the Estonians themselves. Particularly those who had returned to the republic with hopes for an independent state and proved to be foreigners in the homeland of their forebears. They, like the Russian-speaking representatives, have to spend many years here in order for this land to become "theirs" once again.

Is not the "fascist" threat, diluted with an intoxicating national ideology, blatantly obvious to any unbiased individual? The game of nationalist sentiment, which includes gambling with human life, is highly beneficial to certain circles in the republic. Of course, as with the fascists, it is difficult to identify them. Similar versions of their scenario have already been carried out in Lithuania and Latvia, where suspicion has been cast on the Army and the Ministry of Internal Affairs. The threat of a future fascist dictatorship united the people of Estonia momentarily.

However, this unity had no effect on the stated positions of the government and parliament, nor did it eradicate the mounting social problems. But it did open the way for dialogue with the center, giving E. Savisaar's government a chance to listen to the opposition and begin looking for points of contact and ways to compromise. Unfortunately, this does not come easily, mainly because the Estonian leaders reveal inflexibility on the main issue—they refuse to sign the Union treaty, conducting matters as if creating a sovereign state outside the USSR.

Here it is worth remembering that the opposition, which includes "Interdvizheniya" [International Movement of Working People of Estonia], the Estonian Communist Party (CPSU), and the Estonian United Council of Labor Collectives, has no real opportunity for holding an open discussion with the advocates of separatism, who are having no problems popularizing their ideas. One-sided propaganda dominates things—a hodgepodge of social opinion inclines toward the benefits of an "independent Estonia." However, do not be surprised by this. Because the creators of the republic's "new history" have been in no hurry to explain to the people how seceding from the Union will inevitably involve a further decrease in living standards, and I believe that the republic will spend many years serving the West as a market for cheap labor. Remember, this is how it was for many countries which won national independence without having anything to offer on the open market but their labor force. Assurances that having acquired sovereignty Estonia will be able to feed itself, trade with the West on mutually advantageous terms, and obtain vital aid from them do not really convince anybody here.

Today, in fact, the Territorial Defense Department—"Kodukaitse"—which coincidentally is located under the same roof as the department for pricing, has "eaten up" the lion's share of resources which could have been

used to implement social programs and keep pensioners and other vulnerable groups from having to gather bottles from trash cans and make other pitiful efforts to survive in this world. And you know, Estonia intends to set up its own armed force—the need for it was communicated to me by "Kodukaitse" chief of staff A. Eevel—and other state structures, all of which will require enormous sums to maintain.

Even with an extended transitional period, as demanded by members of the Independent Communist Party, the possibility could not be excluded of an Estonia free but starving. This theme is under discussion in the republic, along with the issue of the fate of nonindigenous inhabitants who want to remain in the Union. But is it really a secret that Estonian sovereignty could entail the kind of tension now being experienced in Canada over Quebec. Estonia has its own "Quebec"—the border cities. Narva, for example, where the majority of people are Russian-speakers. For those born there, emigration to the Union will be the equivalent of taking refuge in more familiar living conditions. But will Russia or any of the republics be able to cope with this new wave of refugees? And will it not create new tensions of the sort which have already taken place with refugees in the south, only this time right in the center of the country?

At present, there is much debate surrounding assurances that those wishing to leave Estonia will in fact be granted this right and that funds for building accommodation will be transferred to the local authorities in their future places of abode. Meanwhile, there is no mention of where these funds will be found in the republic budget. And what makes them think that there is room in Russia, for example, to build homes for refugees when the republic's own inhabitants have been waiting ten years or more?

Until recently, silence shrouded the fact that the most vulnerable of the republic inhabitants have been and continue to be the military—officers, warrant officers, ensigns, and the members of their families. As before, the Army is considered an "occupation" force, and there is no shortage of "epithets" directed toward the military from "Geneva-49" and other similar organizations.

Lieutenant Colonel V. Kuznetsov, chief of the Republic Military Commissariat Political Department, showed me dozens of leaflets and booklets geared toward warriors, conscripts, and even officers and ensigns. Neither do the official media stand aside, so to speak, especially in the various districts where Estonia's "rights champions" supporting the new course feel particularly at ease. Local publications openly publicize methods of avoiding military service, while other instructions on this score can be used successfully as an aid for emerging underground organizations.

It is worth adding that barely 30 percent of the scheduled number of conscripts have enrolled voluntarily in units stationed in Estonia. At the same time, the leaders of enterprises where the so-called "objectors" undertake alternative labor service would be only to happy to pass on this very liberal "gift" from the government—the new workers, having acquired a juridical "roof", are clearly not worried about exploring the wonders of labor heroism. The force behind the adoption of the law on alternative service—the Estonian Women's Union—as one of its founders, K. Kilvet, admitted, clearly did not do their sons any favors. And not only their sons, it would seem. Thousands, if not tens of thousands of young men familiar with the dubious delight of violating the law with impunity can hardly be expected to do their republic any good turns in the future, irrespective of whether or not it is sovereign.

Practically nobody denies Estonia's current move toward restoring a bourgeois state within its 1938 borders. Most political activists don't even try to deny it. They continue to play with words like "the Swedish model of socialism", and "socialism with a human face." But there is no question of socialism. Both the legislature and the government hold the view that with the West's help the center's position can be influenced and ultimately forced to change.

With no opening for counterargument in the press, the promises of a cloudless future are winning the day and the republic is systematically being prepared to revert to earlier-defined borders. But there are no guarantees that "partocracy" (and it is against this and the center that the propaganda campaign is aimed) will not be replaced by an even keener dictatorship. This alarms and worries not just Russian-speaking people but also the republic's Communists.

This alarm is by no means unfounded. The Estonian Committee, essentially an extreme left-wing opposition group, is calling for a boycott of the referendum and of decisions containing any hint of a compromise with the Union Government. And you know, all things considered, this is only the tip of the political plans of those intending to return Estonia to the 1920's. "Interdvizheniye" in turn is opposed to holding the 3 March public opinion poll in which the republic authorities are wording the question of Estonia's future, to put it mildly, incorrectly. So the trial by combat goes on. In this connection it could be said that the warnings that a policy of confrontation and civil disobedience will bring Estonia to the brink of civil war, if not today then tomorrow, are alarmist. Let's be realistic and admit that a relevant scenario has already been written for all the Baltic republics.

Nowadays there is a National Accord Commission operating in Tallinn. This commission has set itself highly admirable aims. Because it is only in agreement and in considering each other's interests that a road out of this political impasse can be found.

## RSFSR

### RSFSR Prepares for 17 March Referendums

*LD2502220491 Moscow TASS in English 1559 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[Text] Moscow February 25 TASS—The Russian Federation, the largest of Soviet republics, is getting ready for the national and republican referenda scheduled for March 17.

The referenda intend to find out what the population of the republic think of the need to preserve a single Soviet Union and to introduce the post of Russia's president to be elected in a popular vote.

Chairman of the Central Russian Commission for Holding the Two Referenda Vasiliy Kazakov told TASS that the number of constituencies has already been defined—a total of 88 on Russian territory.

The next step is to equip 100,000 polling stations. The cost estimate of 103 million roubles has been approved for the purpose. Of these, the union will provide 53 million roubles, the rest will be paid from the Russian budget.

The same polling stations will be used in both referenda, the national and the republic's. Voters will be issued two ballot papers, differing in colour and the content of the questions in them.

### Kaliningrad Residents Polled on Referendum

*LD2602104291 Kaliningrad Maritime Press Service in Russian 1500 GMT 22 Feb 91*

[Text] The branch scientific center for public opinion studies has carried out an express telephone poll to clarify the attitude of Kaliningrad residents to future referendums. A total of 507 Kaliningrad residents took part in the poll, representing all administrative-territorial rayons of the city. In favor of retaining the union were 67 percent of workers, 55 percent of engineering-technical staff and intelligentsia, 84 percent of servicemen, and 53 percent of pensioners.

### Buryat Congress Appeals for Union Preservation

*LD2402192391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1240 GMT 24 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Sergey Trofimov]

[Text] Ulan-Ude, 24 Feb (TASS)—The all-Buryatia congress ended here today after three days of discussion. Delegates analyzed the condition of and problems connected with the need to consolidate and revive the nation's spiritual culture. The congress adopted an appeal to fellow countrymen. It stresses the need to preserve the USSR as an equal union of all republics.

Delegates were unanimous in condemning the unconstitutional act of 1937 which divided the republic into three parts and had a negative influence on the development of the Buryat people and its culture. At the same time, the congress was firm in the opinion that now is not the time for political ambitions and that what is needed is consolidation along with unity of purpose, strength, and energy on the part of all caring people who would like to promote the creation of national and cultural autonomy, taking present day realities into consideration.

The congress adopted a review decision and a concept for the revival and development of Buryat culture. In order to implement and coordinate them the congress founded an all-union association of Buryat culture and adopted a charter for it. The leading bodies, a council and a presidium of the new voluntary public association, were elected.

[Word indistinct] protested at assertions made in certain sections of the mass media concerning the congress and alleging that "the republic is reorienting in the direction of an alliance with Mongolia and Asiatic culture."

The council elected the artist Dashinimu Dugarov, a well-known cultural figure in the Transbaykal area, as president of the association from several candidates.

### RSFSR Deputies Criticize Yeltsin's TV Remarks

*PM2602120191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Feb 91 First Edition p 1*

[Report on interviews with RSFSR People's Deputy Zoya Oykina, chairman of the "Rassvet" Kolhoz, Saratov Oblast; RSFSR People's Deputy Mikhail Karev, department chief at No. 7 Hospital, Komsomolsk-na-Amure; and RSFSR People's Deputy Leonid Yasenkov, electric locomotive driver at the East Siberia Railroad depot, Irkutsk, by N. Garifullina on 21 February; place not given: "No to Confrontation, But for How Long?"]

[Text] Judging by numerous telephone calls and telegrams, B.N. Yeltsin's 19 February speech on Central Television produced a lively reaction in society. But how do deputies assess his stance? Yesterday your correspondent talked to RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet people's deputies. This is what they said.

Zoya Oykina: I will say frankly that I was more pleased by the stance adopted by journalist Lomakin and his direct, frank questions. Boris Nikolayevich was unable to reply as directly and frankly. When he began to read the text of his speech, there was a feeling that they were not his words, that someone else was speaking or someone had simply slipped the sheet of paper into his hands. We members of the Supreme Soviet still cherish the hope that it will be possible to find mutual understanding and achieve unity out of common purpose—the good of the people—for the sake of the fatherland, which is in great trouble now. But the head of the legislature is launching a new round of confrontation at this time.

Why are you doing this, Boris Nikolayevich? Only do not tell us that you are doing it for the sake of long-suffering Russia. I will tell you frankly that I am now ashamed to meet with voters. Previously I wore my deputy's badge with pride, but now I hide it when I go out, because people approach me and make me feel ashamed: When are you going to cut out the chatter there and get down to work?

We have been sitting there, on Krasnopresnenskaya Embankment, for almost a year. Have we made any major achievement, what law essential to people's lives have we issued? Nothing, except endless and utterly tedious confrontation with the center, is being achieved. Who needs that? My voters and I certainly do not. If the question of the resignation of the president is raised, then Boris Nikolayevich should go too.

Mikhail Karev: Boris Nikolayevich's interview left a distressing impression. The people are awaiting a solution of the social questions and the economy's emergence from protracted crisis, but Boris Nikolayevich sidestepped that which worries people. However, I was most struck by the statement, which was not agreed with either the Supreme Soviet, of which I am a member, or the Presidium. In my opinion, such a statement can lead either to civil war, since it was inflammatory, or to some progressive democratic forces going underground. The leader of the state had no right to make such a statement without the legislature's consent.

Leonid Yasenkov: Everything Boris Nikolayevich said during the Central Television broadcast was purely his personal position, one which was not agreed with the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. Personal animosity toward the president prevailed once more, and Boris Nikolayevich embarked on his usual confrontation. War was once more declared on the center. Are we not sick and tired of it? After all, a realistic program for overcoming the crisis now depends to a greater extent upon the union government. No matter how much some might wish to see themselves as a separate state, in practice we will not survive without the Union. It has occurred to deputies more than once that the war of laws and confrontation with the Union will only cease with the resignation of Boris Nikolayevich himself.

Why was the document on raising prices proposed by Pavlov not signed? After all, this measure is inevitable and Russia will have to do this. But then comes the public step: "I categorically refuse to sign..." You know, this is simply intolerable. This cannot go on long. I think that our RSFSR Supreme Soviet and its Presidium are on the very verge of a crisis of power...

A couple of words about the "deal of the century." I felt really uncomfortable listening to Boris Nikolayevich trying to whitewash it. No, this is not lack of competence or lack of professionalism. In my opinion, this is a considered action as part of the privatization of enterprises under market conditions. The fact that the stockpiling of these resources was planned in a joint-stock commercial bank only confirms the conjecture: No, this is no mistake at all. The efforts to make us think that our ruble is second rate are too persistent. Yes, when this concerns consumer goods, then we really are making our ruble second-rate by acquiring them abroad and overpaying. But it is hidden from us, you know, that our ruble is worth $3-4-5 when the sale of our enterprises and land is concerned. So here Boris Nikolayevich appeared very, very unconvincing on the television broadcast.

## Yeltsin CNN Remarks on Gorbachev Assailed

*PM2202163791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Feb 91 First Edition p 5*

[A. Tayurskiy report: "On Something With No Name; B.N. Yeltsin's Parallel Interview With the Americans"]

[Text] After B.N. Yeltsin's second interview even a child can see that the root of all our troubles lie at the center and that no one but the USSR president—whose resignation the Russian legislature leader has vigorously demanded, blaming him for all our ills—can pull it out and set it moving along the path of progress.

Many people know about this interview, and everyone who watched or heard it was able to get an impression of the views and ideas espoused by the chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. Few were able to watch his interview with the U.S. CNN last Saturday, 16 February—few people receive the 24-hour channel in our country. However, in that interview too he also voiced unusual opinions, enabling us to broaden our ideas of the present views espoused by the recent pillar of the administrative system who has now become the pillar of Russian democracy.

### Putting Pressure on the Scales

During the interview B.N. Yeltsin, whom television journalists described as "Gorbachev's chief rival," confirmed by his very first opinions that the USSR president is indeed his number one enemy and set about developing this theme. It seems that, while Gorbachev is occupied with seeking political and economic solutions, Yeltsin is occupied solely with Gorbachev. The leader of the Russian legislature warned the world of the danger of Gorbachev's "personal dictatorship," which he could supposedly achieve within a few years: "I said this openly in October 1987. All this time has confirmed that this is the way events are developing."

To hear B.N. Yeltsin, everything that has been done to a considerable extent on M. Gorbachev's initiative in this time—democratic elections, constitutional control, the creation of potential, albeit admittedly underutilized opportunities for soviets at central and local level, and much else—amounts to bricks in an edifice of "personal dictatorship." The U.S. viewer is, after all, unaware that it would have been easy for M. Gorbachev to have

"personal dictatorship" in 1985.... He didn't have to initiate anything—he had gigantic personal power which no dictator could dream of.

B.N. Yeltsin also sees other questions in his CNN TV interview in the light of the dogged rivalry. Perestroyka is dead and was killed by the man who began it... Economic aid should be sent to the republics and not, under any circumstances, to the Union as a whole... The exchange of money "offended every person in our country and gave the economy nothing..." (What about the 8 billion rubles [R] that were not surrendered and the R21 billion that were put on ice because they were tainted? This is not R140 billion, of course, but it's still money!). The price hike which is in preparation is "absurd"... Economic reform "as such is nonexistent"... And so forth.

The aim of this is clear—to tip the scales in the political dispute in his favor. All arguments are good here, but since arguments are in short supply, there's no harm in putting pressure on the scales—perhaps it won't be noticed.

**I Don't Know Where, But We'll Get There...**

During his interview B.N. Yeltsin did not bypass theoretical questions either, since he is now nurtured by the "intellectual might" of the Higher Consultative Council. The interview contained the sensational—you can't call it anything else—news of the death of capitalism...! B.N. Yeltsin interrupted the correspondent in order to clarify his sly question "Do you think that capitalism could flourish in the Soviet Union?" by saying "I don't think capitalism exists any longer"...! The disconcerted correspondent could only burble timorously: "Even in the United States or Japan?" "Yes," came the response, "especially there... Of course, there's no capitalism there—either in the United States or in Japan... I have visited both the United States and Japan. I didn't notice people's lives deteriorating there every year. That means there's no capitalism there. There's another system that has no name as yet. Social scientists have still not devised a suitable term." "But this system with no name," the reporter inquired once he had recovered: "Do you think that it could work in the Soviet Union?" "It could work as a standard of living," B.N. Yeltsin replied. "That's what we're trying to achieve."

Let's pause here a moment. What is the chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet trying to achieve and build in his unfortunate republic? A system that is suitable "as a standard of living"?

He has abused Gorbachev over and over for the fact that perestroyka is not scientifically sound enough—well I never!—and told the huge country: I don't where we're going, but let's go; and I don't know what we're building, but let's do it...

**Persian Motives**

Revelations in a different context—the international context—are worthy of note. In response to the question as to his opinion of the situation in the Persian Gulf the Russian Supreme Soviet chairman said outright: "Psychologically I would say—yes, I am on the U.S. side!" An indicative psychological tendency! Admittedly, like many politicians, B.N. Yeltsin also has reasons for concern at the situation. He is concerned that the war should not be prolonged. But it is not concern for mankind and people that dictates this view. "Scores can only be settled," B.N. Yeltsin believes (this brief phrase reveals his whole philosophy) "in a short war. A protracted war would be a tragedy for the U.S. people and the other peoples of the world." The leader of the Russian parliament is only worried by a possible "U.S. tragedy" owing to a war waged tens of thousands of miles from U.S. borders. Iraq's suffering people, who have already lost more than 100,000 sons and daughters, were not even named—all this is omitted from his arguments! This is, in my opinion, the most suitable time to compare the two lines. Compare the president's grand master tactics, which he has demonstrated over the last few days with particular clarity, and the awkward obeisances that the RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman has made over the last few days to the first foreign correspondent to come along: "Yes, I am on the U.S. side!" It would be no bad thing to be on Russia's side in this situation where the climate around our southern borders is hotting up!

**Spies All Around!**

The CNN interview ends on a dramatic note: "Do you have any fears that you may fall victim to repression?" the correspondent asked sympathetically. "I don't rule that out, but I'm not afraid of it," B.N. Yeltsin replied bravely.

"Do you think that the accidents were arranged by people trying to cause you bodily harm?" "I have had four such accidents in a year. Each time I was forced to think: Is this really an accident?" "What's your opinion," the correspondent probed. "If there's no evidence," B.N. Yeltsin gave a well-considered answer, "it's better not to say things, not to make claims about which you're unsure."

Let me be blunt and say that I was delighted by the good sense of the last phrase, although I did not entirely believe that this good sense was in earnest or would last. After all, the theme of "attempts" [on Yeltsin's life] is the main one in the multifaceted heroic symphony to the glory of Yeltsin. It began at the pre-election rallies and meetings in early spring 1989 when, B.N. Yeltsin says, his "Chayka" was often—suspiciously—involved in arranged, albeit trivial, accidents.

This theme was also "heard" in the skies above Spain when the failure of the second engine—an engine with a backup, moreover—was put down to a plot by dark forces. It arose in the small town of Uspenskiy near Moscow where, according to the first story, a deputy was

thrown off a 15-meter bridge... This theme also arose recently during his whistlestop tour of Estonia, where he picked up some of the heated political overspill of the tragic events in Lithuania: He had to leave Estonia for Leningrad secretly by car, by a circuitous route. For a number of reasons which caused B.N. Yeltsin to smile meaningfully at a press conference...

The only source of delight and reassurance is that the long arms of the "dark forces" are not that long!

**Reflections on the Future**

I would like to ask the leader of the Russian parliament to do one thing: to stop thinking so much and taking such pains over Gorbachev and to free up his valuable time to resolve Russia's problems—there are so many of them now!..

I heard the CNN interview and remembered Jimmy Carter. It's nothing to say that he didn't like Reagan! But when, (straight after Reagan's victory in the presidential election) a smart foreign correspondent tried to get him onto his hobbyhorse and asked Carter to describe Reagan's personal qualities, Jimmy's answer was short and full of dignity. "That's my president!"

Would that we could rise to such unprecedented heights of political tact and self-respect. Yet at the least excuse, mud is slung straightaway, and not only for home consumption either! Have a read and a look, comrades from the world community. That's what we're like.

All this would be laughable were it not so shameful and hard to take.

## Commentary Warns of Military Dictatorship

*LD2402161391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1348 GMT 24 Feb 91*

[Sergey Pustovoy commentary]

[Text] A shortage of conscience and a lack of the sense of measure—that is what I should like to talk about today. We live in a surreal world, where falsehood has declared itself to be truth, and truth of the highest order at that. The information blockade on the democratic Russian Government and the intensive campaign to discredit it have finally confused millions of people. While public opinion is lapping up the details of the investigation of the so-called Filshin and Tarasov affairs, our locomotive is hurtling full steam ahead into the abyss of military dictatorship. Would-be dictators are by no means too shy to state their plans in public; to soothing words about a law-governed state, self-styled imposters from committees for the salvation of their own leadership posts take the liberty of delivering ultimatums with impunity and demanding the resignation of legally elected governments.

Up to now, we have managed to confuse our opponents, not disclosing our aims and keeping them wholly from noticing that our vows to defend legality were but a trick: Goebbels, the author of these words, pronounced them on 5 April 1940. Now it is 1991, but the words sound quite up to date. God grant that this coincidence is mere chance!

It is however, very alarming that terms from the cold war arsenal have started being used. Spies and agents of imperialism are re-emerging, and it is of course the working people who are unmasking them in their numerous letters. Colonel Alksnis tells us about maps on which western special services have allegedly already divided up the USSR; and Prime Minister Pavlov makes a brilliant exposure of a perfidious conspiracy by capitalist bankderse who had the idea of wrecking the Soviet economy, that same economy whose agonies their credits have been spinning out for years already. Weird, or comic—perhaps, were it not so sad. No one will perhaps manage to wreck the Soviet economy now: the Bolsheviks have succeeded in doing that admirably during the 70-odd years they have been in power. But there is great disinclination to carry the responsibility for that, hence the need for enemies. And while the people are sorting out where their own people are and where the foreigners are, this is a very convenient moment to ship 234 tonnes of gold across the ocean on the sly, and to use it to buy dried milk, as we were told. The main thing is, to shout as lound as possible about the mafia in international ties, that is, that same mafia mentioned in the presidential decree: like looking for a black cat in a dark cellar, when there was none there in the first place.

The sole realistic way to preserve the USSR is for each sovereign republic to conclude treaties on the basis of equal rights. This is the way the government of Russia is proceeding. True, in the new union there will in this case be no place for imperialist structures, and this is evidently where the stumbling-block lies between Russia and the so-called center, which in fact shifted far to the right a long time ago now. Having robbed its own people by manipulating banknotes, the government asks: Are you prepared to live in a renewed union? It of course intends to govern this union itself. We have all to give an answer to this question on 17 March. But one must bear in mind here that unfortunately, the words of Julius Fucik are not yet obsolete: People, be vigilant.

## RSFSR Deputy Ponders Republic Flag, Emblem

*LD2602194791 Moscow TASS in English 1110 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow February 26 TASS—Some people believe that it is not timely to discuss Russia's state symbols in conditions of a grave social and economic crisis in the republic, member of the Russian parliament's Presidium Fedor Polenov said.

"But if we speak about sovereignty and the state, we badly need such symbols," Polenov believes.

The Russian parliament's Commission for Culture, led by Polenov, is planning to discuss the issue. "Even between 1918-1919, in the period most difficult for young soviet Russia, time was found to work out its state symbols," he said.

The commission was discussing a new Russian flag, emblem and hymn. The patriotic song by outstanding Russian composer Mikhail Glinka, 1804-1857, outfitted by Andrey Petrov, has already been approved as the Republic's hymn.

Republican residents could already hear it last year during the extraordinary congress of Russian people's deputies. Poets have written several variants of words.

As for the flag and emblem, there should be no haste. It is necessary to think them over thoroughly. The republic's current emblem depicts ears, their number corresponding to that of autonomous formations. Now, that autonomous formations are becoming sovereign, nobody can tell their future number and status.

There are two opinions about the state emblem. Some people believe that it is necessary to return to the one that existed before the revolution. Others say something new should be designed.

There are proposals to retain hammer and sickle in the state emblem. There are "variants that should be discussed", Polenov said. He believes a flower ornament should be used in the emblem, such as a lilac, camomile or forget-me-not. According to Polenov, such an emblem could "symbolise eternal beauty".

Polenov said the idea of a white-blue-red tricolor as a national flag is "supported by people". Polenov, a former Navy officer, favours the white-blue St. Andrew flag, which was flying over Russian Naval ships. He said the current red-blue flag could also remain.

Anyway, symbols are very important, and the problem could be resolved only by popular discussion, Polenov said.

### Supreme Soviet Presidium Session Held 25 Feb

*LD2502222291 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Today, a routine session of the Presidium of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet was held. The agenda for the Third Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR people's deputies and the commission for its preparation was examined. Proposals were discussed on the order of work of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet from 25 February through 1 March. Other issues relating to life in the republic were also examined.

### Russian-Turkish Agreements Signed in Ankara

*LD2602195991 Moscow TASS in English 1125 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondents Valeriy Litvinenko and Yalchin Ali-Zade]

[Text] Ankara February 26 TASS—Documents envisaging the development of economic ties between the Russian Federation and Turkey in various areas of the national economy were signed in Ankara on Monday as a result of official negotiations conducted by the Russian Federation's government delegation headed by Ivan Silayev, the Russian Federation's prime minister.

The agreement between the Russian Federation's Government and the Government of the Republic of Turkey on commercial and economic cooperation envisages, specifically, the setting up of joint ventures, the strengthening of commercial and economic ties and the construction of facilities in the territories of the two countries. The document sets out measures to promote the speeding up of information exchange, the widening of business contacts, encouragement of participation in international exhibition, fairs and other functions. In order to improve cooperation, the sides agreed to form the Russian-Turkish Business Council.

The protocol on cooperation between the Russian Federation and the Republic of Turkey in the area of land reform and development in rural districts envisages the working out and coordination in 1991 of programmes aimed at the development of farms owned by separate households and the participation of Turkish firms and organisations in setting up such farms on the Russian territory.

After official meeting and the signing of the document on the results of the negotiations between the Russian Federation and the Republic of Turkey, the head of the Russian delegation expressed gratitude to the Turkish Government and people for attaching much importance to the consolidation of friendship and cooperation between Russian and Turkish peoples, for warm understanding and sincere hospitality. The Russian Federation prime minister invited his Turkish counterpart to pay a visit to Russia.

### More on Commission Findings on KGB Bugging Claims

*PM2702122491 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Feb 91 Second Edition p 6*

["USSR KGB Announcement" under the rubric "Attention: Disinformation"]

[Text] As already reported in the mass media, on 6 February members of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet chairman's security service, in violation of the rules in force, broke down the door to the USSR KGB's official room, room 4-120 in zone A of the RSFSR House of the Soviets building, which was allocated to the KGB in 1981 when

the building came into use. The security men tried to persuade people's deputies and journalists who were present that the special equipment in this room was bugging apparatus.

With a view to resolving the question of the real purpose of this equipment, the RSFSR Supreme Soviet formed a deputies' commission. On its instructions an independent technical expert commission was set up, its personnel being agreed with I.S. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, and approved by the deputies' commission.

The experts have now completed their work and submitted their findings. They concluded unequivocally that the KGB apparatus and equipment in the RSFSR House of the Soviets building was intended, by virtue of its composition and technical specifications, for information protection of important premises in the building, and could not be used for bugging. Such equipment is used by the USSR KGB for information protection of particularly important official premises in other government buildings too.

The findings of the independent expert commission have been sent to B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, and I.S. Silayev, chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

It is noteworthy that the RSFSR Council of Ministers leadership had long known of the existence in this building of an official room with KGB apparatus, and its real purpose. Existing documents provide convincing evidence of this.

Thus statements that KGB bugging apparatus had been found in the Russian House of the Soviets building are patently slanderous and provocative.

Unfortunately, various kinds of absolutely unfounded public assertions by the RSFSR Supreme Soviet leaders and security staffers concerning the activity of USSR state security organs have recently become more frequent.

In this connection the question arises: Who benefits from provocations of this kind, designed to whip up social tension in the country?

The USSR KGB expresses the hope that RSFSR Supreme Soviet deputies will give a due assessment of these unworthy actions.

## Smolensk Rejects 'Special Regime' Proposal

*PM2202135591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Feb 91 Union Edition p 1*

[From the IZVESTIYA, TASS, BALTFAX, INTERFAX, REUTER, UPI column: "What Is Being Prepared In Smolensk?"]

[Text] A session of Smolensk Oblast Soviet has discussed the draft decision "On the Implementation of the 'Provision for a Legal Regime for the Anomalous Situation and State of Emergency, and On the Status of the Oblast Soviet's Special Committee.'"

The draft envisages, for example, the introduction of a special regime to cover citizens' movements, a ban on rallies, meetings, strikes, and the use of copying and recording equipment, the monitoring of the press, the imposition of a curfew, and the halting of political parties' activities.

It is proposed to task the chairman of the oblast KGB Administration with executing the decision. IZVESTIYA's own correspondent I. Ognev asked V. Abramenkov, chief of the oblast soviet's Organizational Department, whose initiative this was. It turns out that the Smolensk people were attracted by the experience of their neighbors in Vitebsk Oblast. It was discussed at the last CPSU Central Committee plenum by V. Grigoryev, first secretary of Vitebsk Obkom [oblast party committee]. A special committee has been set up in Vitebsk. The deputies in Smolensk rejected the draft on first reading. But this is now. What about tomorrow?

## Prokofyev Sees 'Fascists' at Work in Lithuania

*PM2602160591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Feb 91 Union Edition p 2*

[INTERFAX report under IZVESTIYA, TASS, INTERFAX, SIBINFORM roundup: "Lithuania Within Its 1939 Borders?"]

[Text] Addressing staff of the Moscow State Institute for International Relations 21 February, Yuriy Prokofyev, leader of Moscow's communists, said that in his opinion Lithuania's present leaders are "too pink" in the eyes of the new wave of local politicians, whom he described as "fascists." "That is why," Yu. Prokofyev said, "Prunskiene is no more and there will soon be no more Landsbergis." According to the Moscow Communists' leader, "the fascists are striving to take revenge for the years of Soviet rule," INTERFAX reports.

At the same time, Yu. Prokofyev reckons that the center should recognize Lithuania's incorporation into the USSR as annexation—"as the Lithuanians are demanding"—and also agree to the republic's seceding from the Union, but only within the 1939 borders. "The nationalist forces trying to secure Lithuania's secession are concealing from the people the adverse consequences of that step," Yu. Prokofyev said.

## Communist Party's Polozkov on Attitudes to Army

*PM2502111691 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 22 Feb 91 First Edition p 2*

[Interview with I.K. Polozkov, first secretary of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee, by N. Belan; place and date

not given; under the rubric "The Army in Society": "The Defender's Prestige: Conversation with I.K. Polozkov, First Secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] [Belan] It was only too rightly said: The destinies of society and the Army are inseparable. But today we are living through a period when our Army has almost found itself in the position of a stepdaughter. The Armed Forces are being blatantly denigrated; generals are being pitted against the officers corps while both generals and officers are being pitted against the soldiers, and all servicemen—against their parents. What is the reason for this? What is it—the inevitable flaws of perestroyka?

[Polozkov] I think that it is incorrect to associate this attitude toward the Army, displayed by individual groups and strata of society, with perestroyka. Our people have always nurtured, still nurture, and will nurture the most respectful and most solicitous attitude toward their armed defenders. After all, they are our sons, our own children. The memory of relatives lost in the Great Patriotic War is still alive and still painful in many families to this day—it is an unhealable wound, time cannot heal it even though it will soon be 50 years since that dreadful war ended. Those infected by unconsciousness are, of course, incapable of comprehending the source of this love felt by the whole people for their Armed Forces but, fortunately, there are very few such people in our country. I base my opinion on, for example, my meetings in labor collectives. There are at least one or two questions that people ask without fail: Why not put an end to attacks against the Army, could it be that our leaders do not realize that if the Army is destroyed the state will also be destroyed?

Incidentally, a rally in support of the Armed Forces will be held Saturday, on Soviet Army and Navy Day. Is it not indicative that one of its first initiators was the Khrunichev Plant collective?

Will there be any alternative demonstrations to the one scheduled for Manezhnaya Square 23 February? I do not know. But as a human being, I must admit that I cannot see any reasons for alternatives. Alternative to what? To our respect for the soldiers, sergeants, ensigns, and officers who are performing their tough service? To our memory of those who died during the Great Patriotic War? Or to the alarm and concern caused by the most acute social and daily life problems existing in the Army?

Some people seem to be reaching the point of absurdity in their desire to spite the Communists, veterans, workers, and military come what may, to present "their alternative." This is almost like a theater of the absurd: People who style themselves democrats categorically reject dissidence and even refuse to accept the fact that someone else might have his own beliefs. Generally speaking, this phenomenon deserves in-depth analysis, a social interpretation. I really regret that our incipient democracy might be stifled by such pseudodemocrats, that the historical chance presenting itself to society might be missed.

Therefore, perestroyka is not to blame for the Army's denigration. This denigration is a link in the chain of attacks being launched against our state system, our ideology, the communists, and the state organs. And these attacks are not due to the fact that our system, structures, and party have shortcomings, they are due to the fact that we have made the socialist choice. This is the heart of the matter. This is why the people are being persuaded that everything in our history is bad, that we have been going the wrong way for 70 years, that we have no guidelines, and so on.

Yet the Army is part of the people, part of our history. Therefore, its past is altogether useless and the present must be demolished. The destruction syndrome is not caused by naivete, everything is well thought out and planned, these people know very well what they want. Incidentally, if they were to come to power, the first thing they would do would be to ban all criticism of the Army and extirpate all dissidence within the Army, they would do this in order to ensure that it is solid and loyal to them...

[Belan] The law on defense is soon to be adopted. Numerous debates are now under way around it. In your opinion, what is the most fundamental point it should enshrine?

[Polozkov] The servicemen's rights. I think that this is still the weakest link. People in uniform have numerous duties and they are, by the way, sacredly performed, but when it comes to rights... The legislative consolidation of their rights is especially important now, in the new economic conditions, when the country is switching to the market. Our defenders themselves need to be defended today.

[Belan] In this case, what is your attitude toward the professionalization of the Armed Forces?

[Polozkov] But they are fundamentally professional. I mean their backbone—the corps of officers, ensigns, and warrants officers. It is a different matter when we come to demands that the Army should be hired [nayemnaya]. Let us not delve into this problem's political aspects, and let us leave aside even the Russian Army's historical roots and traditions. Let us examine just one aspect—the economy, our material potential. Will we be able to maintain the hired personnel [nayemnik], seeing that even today we lack the resources to ensure normal social and daily life conditions for our officers and ensigns? And what about their material situation?

Some people had made some really smart calculations before launching the myth about the military's large salaries. But judge for yourself how large they are, bearing in mind that the commander of an airborne assault division earns as much as a Moscow bus driver, and maybe even less. I have respect for the driver's labor,

but there is no comparison between the responsibility borne by these people. A division commander has thousands of subordinates, there are hundreds of combat equipment units "around his neck," he is responsible for the performance of tasks on a vast scale! Therefore, the question is: What further "professionalization" is needed to make his salary commensurate with his knowledge, experience, and responsibility? And when it comes to retirement, they have neither home nor hearth.

I believe that our society still owes a lot to the military. We have the lowest-paid Army, and yet we allow it to be besmirched, we allow its honor and dignity to be belittled. Not a single hired serviceman would stand for anything of the sort. I think that the time will come when we will feel ashamed to face our children and brothers wearing the military uniform. Today they find it even more difficult than we do, being tired and embittered by material hardships, interethnic conflicts, and so on. How, for example, can an officer's family make ends meet if the wife is unable to work? How can they carry on moving from one hostel to another without serving long enough in one place to qualify for an apartment?

[Belan] What is your attitude toward demands for the depoliticization and de-partyization of the Armed Forces?

[Polozkov] They are absolutely and totally groundless and fabricated. Their aim is to squeeze party organizations and our state ideology out of military units. Let's get this right, there can be no ideological vacuum, man is not a robot. You can have pluralism at the level of debates and political streams, but you must have a single ideology on a statewide scale.

Time has already put everything in its proper place: What our radicals are demanding is not the de-partyization of our Armed Forces but their re-partyization. This is why they are striving to infiltrate the military collectives and create organizations of their own parties there. The only thing that seems to be beyond them so far is to push the Communist Party out. There are more than 1.1 million communists serving in the Army and Navy—it is impossible to physically replace them, and it will also prove impossible to convert them to a different faith because they are being offered nothing but "Down With!" slogans to replace the communist ideas.

The CPSU is being vilified now: It has apparently "seized" the Armed Forces. But these people have forgotten that the Communist Party created them jointly with the people, it brought them up to their present level of training and equipment. What is this, has some new party emerged today—which may not even last very long—so that influence in the Army should be surrendered for the sake of its ambitions? Will our people permit such experiments with the Army?

One more point: The basic object of concern by party organizations in the Army and Navy is the high standard of units' and subunits' combat training, their readiness to reliably defend the fatherland, the creation of a healthy moral and ethical atmosphere in military collectives. Marching in the vanguard, communists take upon themselves the performance of the most complex and most responsible tasks. So what is the CPSU doing wrong in the Armed Forces, are these tasks at odds with the people's interests?

[Belan] How do you appraise the attempts to split the Army along republican lines, including the creation of Russian Armed Forces?

[Polozkov] Should this split occur, this would be a great calamity not only for the Union but also for the whole world. And for the republics themselves, of course. Just imagine each republic having its own nuclear weapons in today's confrontation involving ethnic of border questions, for example. Where is the guarantee that they will not be used against some awkward and "obstinate" neighbor? The Army's split would mean the Union's decomposition because unified defense and its economic backup are what provides our firm bond today.

[Belan] Does the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee have its own vision of our state's military policy, concerning primarily military building, conversion, and the solution of social problems?

[Polozkov] All these questions are the prerogative of the state and the country's Supreme Soviet. We are prepared to play our part at the level of USSR and Russian Supreme Soviet level, through communist deputies and legislative initiatives, in helping the Army implement the military reform and solve the social problems.

On the other hand, we believe that all the questions you have raised are strictly specific, let specialists tackle them. We have no desire to be like those who previously sneaked into agriculture, and are now equally unceremoniously sneaking into the Army, "to impose order." In my opinion, there are plenty of examples showing where this could lead. As for helping military units at local level to solve some acute economic or daily life problems or tackle young people's military patriotic education—this is well within the party committees' potential.

[Belan] It has been said repeatedly that the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee is firmly taking the military's side. How correct are such claims?

[Polozkov] There are several obvious reasons which prompt this question. From the very first steps in the Russian Communist Party's creation, we developed a warm and solicitous attitude toward the Army, a comprehension of its difficulties and problems. Furthermore, our party consistently upholds the Union's unity, and the Army is built on these very same principles. We also have our attitude toward the military, toward the attempts to discredit them and belittle the prestige of the motherland's armed defenders.

[Belan] Does your Central Committee have a Military Department?

[Polozkov] No. I think that, in the long term, there will be a group of consultants to maintain ties between the Central Committee and local party committees and the party organizations in military units.

[Belan] Each one of us, even outright civilians, is tied to the Army by a multitude of invisible threads. Have you or your relatives served?

[Polozkov] Yes, I have served—I was a seaman with the Baltic Fleet in 1954-1957. This is a very important period of my life for me—I acquired a sound moral and physical tempering. It was there, while in the fleet, that I became a communist.

My father was also a soldier and lost his life during the war. Thus, the memory of the war is acutely alive to this day.

We are approaching the 50th anniversary of the start of the war, the 50th anniversary of the difficult path that our people traversed to gain victory. This topic will acquire paramount importance in our Communist Party's activity. We all must display an especially solicitous and sympathetic attitude toward veterans—frontline soldiers and working people from the rear—and do everything possible to improve their material position.

All peoples have at all times maintained an unambiguous attitude toward their defenders. The degree of a society's civilization has been judged by its attitude toward officers and the concern showed for veteran soldiers. I think that it would be useful to bear this in mind and ponder it today...

## Communist Party Plenum Documents Published

*91UN0910A Moscow VETERAN in Russian*
*No 7, Feb 91 p 3*

[Text]

### Communist Initiative

Our newspaper reported in detail last year on the First Initiating Congress of Communists of Russia and its decisions. A joint plenum of the Organizing Bureau and Central Control Commission, which discussed the economic and political situation and questions on the preparation of the Second Initiating Congress of Communists of Russia, was held recently in Moscow. A working group for preparation of the draft CPSU Fourth Program was organized.

Unfortunately, information in the press is, as usual, very sparse and indistinct when it is a question of the initiating movement of Russia's Communists. For this reason we offer several documents adopted by the plenum.

### Attitude Toward Joint Ventures of the USSR

The four years of the development of joint enterprise in the Soviet Union have from the viewpoint of specific benefits for the bulk of the population produced, with the rare exception, a practically zero result. Dozens and hundreds of all kinds of associations and commercial centers are arising like fungi in a swamp. According to economists' estimates, no more than 10 percent of the total number of over 2,000 joint ventures registered as of the end of 1990 is really operating, and all kinds of brokerage and commercial and speculative enterprises, which are in many cases a legal cover for the laundering of "dirty" money of "shadow" national capital, and the international mafia account for more than half those that are operating. The vast majority of the joint ventures in the USSR are the source of a pumping into ready cash of unearned money and a powerful additional source of inflation and the formation of speculative demand on an already depleted consumer market. The high unearned wages of the personnel of many joint ventures secured by preferential taxation conditions and the artificially created preferential position of these enterprises compared with ordinary enterprises represent a form of the bribery and corruption of part of the working class and working engineering intelligentsia.

The activity of a number of joint ventures has in terms of their methods assumed the nature of international cooperatives along whose channels there are drained from the country most important types of raw material and Soviet and foreign currency, which is directly and immediately undermining the foundations of the state and national security of the USSR.

The insufficient development of a number of legislative provisions concerning the activity of joint ventures in the USSR affords no guarantee that even those engaged in real productive work will not play the part of a Trojan horse with the aid of which obsolete equipment and technology—environmentally dirty, what is more—will enter and already are entering the country. A real danger of the country becoming a giant dumping ground for the transnational corporations would thereby be created.

On behalf of the Communists of Russia the plenum of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Initiating Communist Movement Organizing Bureau and Central Control Commission demands:

an immediate inspection of the financial activity of all joint ventures on the territory of the USSR and their reregistration;

the urgent adoption of provisional regulations on strict economic control of the facilities being organized at the joint ventures and the corresponding revisions and additions to current legislation governing joint ventures;

strict control of the further growth of the numbers of joint ventures and the immediate closure, per the results of the inspection, and reregistration of nonproduction joint ventures;

the establishment of control over the joint ventures' wage fund and its fair taxation and the revision of a number of provisions concerning preferential taxation of joint venture profits in the direction of greater approximation to the conditions under which the outfits of Soviet enterprises operate.

The activity of joint ventures under the strict control of Soviet society!

Plenum of the Russian Initiating Communist Movement Organizing Bureau and Central Control Commission

**Attitude Toward the Cooperative Movement**

The cooperative movement as it has taken shape in recent years is at an impasse and has become a serious factor of socioeconomic destabilization in the USSR. Lenin's idea of joint labor, to which leaders of the party and the country constantly refer in justification of the benefits obtained by the modern cooperativists, and the practice of a civilized cooperative movement in developed states of the West have nothing in common with the deformed crime-breeding monster that has formed with us, where the tune is called mainly by obviously profiteering supply and sales and trading and purchasing cooperatives.

It has become the pattern that it is these institutions that enjoy special attention and patronage on the part of unscrupulous corrupted government officials and the so-called "democrats" from the newly elected soviets, obtaining all the benefits and advantages determined by law for cooperatives, and also of the smart operators of the "shadow" economy. The production and agricultural cooperatives, on the other hand, which could be of real benefit to the populace, have been left without practical state support. Many of them have under these conditions embarked upon the unchecked pumping of deposit money into cash, transferring the bulk of income into wages for their employees, chairmen, and members of the board particularly, which not one state-owned enterprise, inhibited by strict rules, may allow itself.

A year ago the cooperatives, producing 40 billion rubles [R] of goods and services, sent the lion's share thereof—R33 billion—to state-owned enterprises, meticulously obtaining this enormous sum in the form of wages. These "goods and services" dissolved in the giant pot of the production kitchen, and the population obtained only R7 billion thereof—in quantity and quality somewhat less and at a price somewhat more, naturally. The legalized plunder of the working man and all working people on a scale unknown even to the so-called "stagnation" times is occurring under these conditions.

Expressing primarily the interests of working people living on wages in the state sector of the economy, the members of the Russian Initiating Communist Movement Organizing Bureau and Central Control Commission demand of the country's leadership:

revisions to the Cooperative System in the USSR Act and an immediate termination of the practice of the cooperatives being accorded benefits and privileges at the expense of state-owned enterprises and organizations;
equal socioeconomic status not in words but in practice for enterprises of the cooperative and state sectors, unwarranted restrictions being lifted from the latter;
a strict stock-taking of the trading and purchasing and supply and sales cooperatives with the closure of those whose activity is of a profiteering nature;
the granting to production, agricultural, and maintenance cooperatives that sell their product to the population at prices maximally approximating official prices of tax and other benefits.

Plenum of the Russian Initiating Communist Movement Organizing Bureau and Central Control Commission

**Open Letter to the Communist M.S. Gorbachev**

Dear Mikhail Sergeyevich! We members of the Moscow Leninist Communists Club received with satisfaction the results of the Fourth Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR, which rebuffed the anticommunist and anti-Soviet aspirations of the "ultraperestroyka" forces—the destroyers of our state. It is of fundamental importance that the congress unequivocally supported the preservation of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, thereby confirming the name and socialist choice of a future renewed federation of equal and sovereign republics.

Some 189 deputies, including leaders of the "democrats" known to all—B. Yeltsin, G. Popov, A. Sobchak and S. Stankevich, Academician O. Bogomolov, a former senior official of a CPSU Central Committee department, who had been greatly favored by the official schedule of appointments, one further academician, A. Arbatov, who was formerly a special retainer in L.I. Brezhnev's retinue, and a number of other no less "high-minded" personalities who had each lived more prosperously than the other in the years of so-called stagnation, but who now with the facility of a chameleon have changed their coloring and are shamelessly deceiving (yet again!) people who believed in them—voted against this proposal. However, two names on this list could not have failed to have attracted particular notice, about which we wish to inform you, Mikhail Sergeyevich.

Among those who voted against confirmation of the socialist nature of our social system in the country's name were two of your aides: academician N. Petrakov, presidential assistant, and G. Shakhnazarov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences and assistant to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Both are people who are quite well known. The economist N. Petrakov and the political scientist G. Shakhnazarov, the author of numerous works, including school textbooks on the social science of former years that extolled the advantages of the socialist system, could not have failed to have been aware of the importance of

the step they were taking. In any country under any social system, people constituting the leader's closest associates contribute to the formulation of his policy and its implementation. How in this connection can we evaluate the position of N. Petrakov and G. Shakhnazarov? What policy were they expressing by their vote against the concept of "socialism," sacred to a majority of Soviet people, in the name of our state? If their own, they are thereby in breach of elementary ethical standards, exposing their own immediate leader, that is, you, Mikhail Sergeyevich. There arises the legitimate question: Can such people, who deny the socialist choice in our country's future, be your aides and pursue your policy of strengthening and improving? They are not private individuals, after all.

Incidentally, concerning private individuals. As we can see, it is people for whom it would be a sin, to put it mildly, to take offense at socialism who are for the umpteenth time acting the part of the fiercest "exposers" and "over throwers" of socialism. More, and this is what is most important, those who not that long ago were making a considerable contribution to imparting the character of stagnation to socialism. Now, apparently, they are spurning in every possible way what they did, but, note, by no means they themselves who did it. How can Soviet people believe them? And we would like here, Mikhail Sergeyevich, to make a suggestion. Would it not be right upon an analysis of the various factors in accordance with which the socialist system in our country was unable to reveal all its potential advantages to necessarily point to the fact that the front ranks of the "creators" of this system had been penetrated by dishonest people with a total lack of any principles and morals—even in a class, even in a general dimension? If they "built" socialism this way, we can only marvel at the strength of the foundations of our system and the exploit of preceding generations of Soviet people who laid this foundation, whose destruction was beyond the capacity of a whole legion of political chameleons and turncoats. Glory to this system and such people! We believe, esteemed Mikhail Sergeyevich, that such information and such considerations could help you in the pursuit of a policy of continued comprehensive development of socialism in our country—the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Adopted in Moscow at a meeting of the city council of the Moscow Leninist Communists Club.

## Western Republics

### President Gorbachev Visits Minsk, Gomel Oblast

#### Arrives in Minsk

*LD2602165691 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] USSR President Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev arrived in Minsk today. He was met at the airport by Belorussian Supreme Soviet Chairman Dementey and other republican leaders.

#### Visits Tractor Factory

*LD2602163791 Moscow TASS in English 1553 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondents Tatyana Khryapina and Vladimir Glod]

[Text] Minsk February 26 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev, upon arriving in the capital of Soviet Belorussia today, visited the Minsk Tractor Works.

The works managers told the president about prospects for the development of the enterprise which specialises in the production of row-crop wheeled tractors.

Gorbachev familiarised himself with the operation of a pilot plant, the main assembly line, and viewed an exhibition of tractors—ranging from the firstling of Belorrussian tractor manufacture to present-day high-powered tractors which are exported to 80 countries.

By the results of last year, the works is heading the list of the Soviet Union's major exporters.

Sharing his impressions, the president said that the tractor works epitomises everything that takes place in Belorussia at this difficult time when immense tasks are being addressed and the Soviet Union as a whole is radically changing. Belorussians carry out this complex work with great responsibility, he said.

Then Gorbachev addressed the works personnel in their Palace of Culture.

#### Addresses Tractor Workers

*LD2602193491 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1640 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Address by USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev to Minsk Tractor Works employees at the Minsk Tractor Works on 26 February—recorded]

[Text] I am happy that I have at least accomplished both my wish and, I see, my direct duty, to come to Belorussia and meet the working people of Belorussia. I intend to spend the next two days after my stay in Minsk in the area that has found itself in the most disastrous position as a result of the Chernobyl accident—I refer to Gomel Oblast and Mogilev Oblast—to spend those two days there, listening and looking around, and discussing everything once again. It is being emphasized here that Belorussia knows its responsibility, and will do everything possible to advance the cause of perestroyka. That is evident; that is confirmed by the facts, although I also see many anxieties here. First of all, I wanted to greet you, tractor builders, and all the working people of Belorussia. Thank you for the good tractors. I think you

know that they are, perhaps, the best tractors in the country. Thank you for the concern, worry, and anxiety to see that you go on providing the country with more of these tractors, not just those that you have produced so far, for I have seen what you are planning. There is an enormous need for this, especially in regard to the great reform that is taking place in the countryside. That is the first point.

A few words about the position within the country. Our position is a difficult one. There is instability in society, political and social tension, and disrupted economic ties. All this is being rightly said; it is not just being said; we feel that a great threat to our whole economy is growing out of this, and, if a breakdown, a slump, occurs here, it will affect the implementation of the whole program of perestroyka and the socioeconomic policy and the position and lives of people who are already stretched to the limit. The main issue is restoring economic ties and imparting to them a nature that would make it possible for every labor collective to develop and to display its ability to get down to work efficiently and well. The market is destroyed and processes are taking place—primarily in interethnic relations—that no longer can remain in such a state either, especially since, if that tendency is not halted, it contains no less a threat than the processes within the economy. But, all this is, in fact, connected, Comrades.

We are now hearing the direct question: What are we to do? Either we have lost our way, or we are not going in the right direction, or we should turn back and return to 1985, or maybe to 1983, and it is no coincidence that I mention those years. Comrades, with total frankness and conviction, on the basis of knowledge—and I understand my responsibility both to you and to all our people—I have to say that, in reply to the question of whether we should return and start discarding everything that we have done in these years, I believe that would be the greatest mistake we could commit. In general, there is nothing to return to, let me tell you. It can only appear at first glance that everything used to be normal and that everything has exploded and assumed a character which has literally brought the whole country and each family to a state of alarm.

I have to say that it was already clear at the end of the 1970's and the beginning of the 1980's that we could not carry on conducting affairs in the country in the way we were, either in the economy, or in politics, or in other spheres of the life of the society. What am I talking about? As early as then, we were already doing enormous work behind closed doors, perhaps even secretly, to work out what was happening to us. National income fell from 30 percent in the Eighth Five-Year Plan to 9 percent. Labor productivity virtually declined by half and then went to zero, from 10 to 7, and so on. We were using 1 and ½ to 2 times more electricity, fuel, metal, and cement per unit of national income than developed countries. While we had inexhaustible resources, the oil market was looking good, and we had inexhaustible labor resources; we got ourselves out of trouble with them, and we added to it by distilling vodka. We started running short of labor resources everywhere, in all spheres. To extract natural resources, we had to go to new, unpopulated areas and incur enormous expense. As they say, the time for making fools of ourselves had ended. Oil prices, as a result of the fact that the West understood what we should have understood and should have done back at the start of the 1970's, and they did it. [sentence as heard] They did a huge amount of work to change the whole structure of production. You remember the 30 million unemployed at the start of the 1970's, after the oil crisis. We said that was capitalism for you, but everything was all right here.

Nevertheless, we already said at that stage that we need to tackle scientific and technological progress. We announced a plenum; we were preparing measures; it was essential to get things going, and all that was understood already at that stage, especially by the best minds of the country. But, it did not come about; even the plenum failed to take place, and two sacks of materials for this plenum, along with two variants of the report due to have been delivered, continue to gather dust. This then, is the situation, you know. We came to a point when we could no longer carry on like that. It is this inertia that brought us to this condition. Do you think that in an economy and country where there are 300 million and this huge potential...[changes thought] it now, you know, all that which is negative, these trends, as they became ingrained, they are now taking us by the throat.

I think that you will understand that I wish to conduct a conversation with you in an objective and honest manner, so that we understand each other. The economy is overloaded with heavy industries and only between about 6 and 10 percent of the capital stock works solely to produce consumer goods for the people. It is the world's most militarized economy. Ours is the most colossal defense expenditure among developed countries, and it used to claim up to 18—and if you stop to count, 20—percent of the national income. We planned a 22 percent increase in the national income and a 45 percent increase in defense expenditure. How could this have been done? After all, it is clear that it was at the expense of the living standard, if the national income rises by 20 percent while this expenditure rises by 45 percent, at the expense of the cuts in the resources for modernizing the economy and for developing sectors that work for the people.

If I augment all that with what was taking place as far as the political process is concerned, no one could so much as say a word. I do not even mean casting aspersions on the country, the people, and history, no, I mean, words of truth, about the fact that something needs to be done at the enterprise, the region, or the republic. The best thing that could happen to those who, nevertheless, wanted to speak, was to be prevented from doing so, otherwise you know where they used to end up. The political process was such that no one, you know, was interested in the

views of the working class, the peasantry, or the intelligentsia. What are we? Brainwashed? Should we have reconciled ourselves with this?

When people talk now, suggesting that Gorbachev is clamoring for power, that he is concentrating power, as though it were the case that some sort of a latter-day monster of perestroyka has emerged, it is all rubbish. There was not, nor will there be, more power, or more dictatorship, or bigger resources than the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee had at his disposal in any single state. If the point revolves around power, there was no need to change anything. The laws had no restraining effect at all: Just go ahead and do everything you decided. That is why we could not live like that. It was already obvious. It was necessary to change things. Have we, indeed, understood everything? No, we have not understood everything, but the first thing we wanted to do was to overcome things and to make some sort of dash forward through productivity which was, in industry, 2 and ½ times lower and in agriculture five times lower than in developed countries; hence, the idea of acceleration; hence the emphasis on Soviet engineering, which was neglected. We made 10 billion available to take in hand. We worked out a program. We began these processes; if it was performed badly or ineptly, change them, because their effects are being felt now. Comrade Pugin, the former director of the Gorkiy Works and later on a minister, one of the young ones who have come along already during the perestroyka years, knows how this got off the ground, and others—likewise, your directors—know, too. All this was in progress, but we came to see that this mechanism was not moving and gathering momentum for real. It comes up against the command structures, the rigid planning, the limits, against the fact that the powers that be would prescribe everything, down to a single nail.

The economy cannot go on in such a way in such a vast country, with 15 republics. It was necessary to start the economic reform, to introduce incentives so that people would turn to production and feel their link with it and not just have the attitude: I turned up, so pay up; sign the worksheet; you understand that, if you don't sign for 10, I'll go where they'll sign for 12. All this used to happen, we know all of this.

There is no going back. What is there to go back to? We have started all of this, and much else, besides. We have embarked upon the political process, upon political reform, and upon reforming the Union to give incentives in the economy, in our federation, and in the political process, in democracy. We have travelled along that path, but we have not been able to link all this in the proper way into a system, and, as a result, it has turned out that checking of the interrelationship between labor productivity and wages has disappeared. Expenditure on capital construction not only did not decline but even increased. The consequence of this was long unfinished building projects, and not only was the amount of incomplete work not reduced, but a vast proportion of the national income got buried. No small number of mistakes were made.

I think that we must now get through this stage more quickly; since we have started moving toward the market, we should move more quickly; since we have started moving via the reformation of the Union, we should move more quickly to conclude a Union treaty and to redistribute powers; since we have entered the path of democratization, then it is necessary to insist strictly that all of this should be regulated by and be based strictly on the law, within the framework of the law.

All of these processes are currently proceeding painfully. We decided to convene, on 4 March, a special meeting of the cabinet of ministers to review, on the basis of two months of work, how the economic agreement is being fulfilled, which we, all the republics, signed on economic links and on all taxes and all matters and the food agreement. We are inviting the prime ministers or the chairmen of the councils of the ministers of all republics, the deputies in charge of supply, and the deputies in charge of agrarian matters. I wish to conduct this session of the committee myself, to sum up the results and to take those steps which are essential.

Regarding this, another matter at issue is that, if it is necessary, then we should examine once again the priorities and, on the basis of these priorities, decide the question of metals, chemicals, fuel, and so on, and of foreign currency, and so on.

as far as the Union is concerned, the reforming of the Union, the Union treaty, yes, here I think that we are, on the whole, on the right path because the republics should be the ones in charge [khozyain] and further, so to say, feel, themselves—well, not more, but full-bloodedly—the ones in charge, within the framework of their sovereignities, within the framework of the new powers. Therefore, everything should depart from the center, and there should remain in the center only those things needed by all republics. Defense is needed; unified power generation is needed.

A certain range of fuel issues in which all have an interest are necessary. Railway tranportation and communications are single entities and are necessary. All this has to be agreed upon, what is necessary for the republics themselves, for breaks in these areas would tear up the economic market—and it has already started to be wrecked—and would ultimately disorganize the economy. And, all the same, in one way or another, the economy will force us to do all of this. We must not do stupid things. We have to distribute the powers correctly and then, no doubt, somewhere around 70 percent or 80 percent, and in other cases 90 percent, will go to the republics.

Following discussion at the Federation Council, near Moscow, the authorized representatives of all republics are completing the draft Union treaty on the basis of

observations and proposals which were expressed at the Federation Council. All are participating there, including a delegation from Belorussia. I believe that by 1 March—5 March at the very latest—the first version of the draft, created by the republics themselves in consultation with experts, lawyers, sociologists, and so on, will be delivered. It will be sent to all members of the Federation Council. Therefore, that will give us the opportunity to arrive at a correct distribution of powers and to stop waging this war, so to speak, which is disorganizing not just economic but social life, too, which is disorganizing relations between the republics, and introducing confrontation, and so on, giving rise to great alarm.

One might ask: What does it amount to, the idea that is now being born in those circles, so to speak, of representatives from republics? It is the idea of a federation, of a renewed federation. Not all agree with this; some have sent observers; with others—with the Baltics—we are conducting contacts and working through these issues within the framework of commissions. I think that what is going to be proposed by the republics already there, their representatives—practically all are participating as observers—this is going to be a step which will make it possible for us to move resolutely toward the renewal of the Union. All remaining issues, I am confident, will follow this step logically. We will not waste time; We will not waste time.

I personally, was and remain a convinced champion of the view that, in the way in which we have come into being both over the centuries and over the past few decades, and also from the point of view of the economy and science and the distribution of the forces of production and cultural links and demography, we cannot divide ourselves. That would give rise to such confrontation, to such an escalation of opposition that will absolutely, without fail, lead to great bloodshed and great clashes. I can say this in advance simply after seeing it through previous experience, as has been shown by the first steps and the first bitter experience. What we have to do, therefore, is move along the path of distributing powers and of real sovereignty within the framework of the renewed Union.

It is possible to achieve this goal, and everyone's mood will improve from the view of the new powers and the realization of their right on sovereignty and from the view of retaining such cooperation within the framework of the reinvigorated center. I am convinced that our people will speak in favor of precisely this at the 17 March referendum.

Those who wish to cast doubt, who wish to go against the will of the people, those who wish to cast doubt, say: What a complex formula has been proposed. It is difficult to understand this. Let's simplify it. This idea has also been expressed in your legislature. What is difficult to understand here? I won't read it out as it is written down, but the issue that is put forward in it is of the socialist choice. That is what is in there: the Union of the Socialist Republics. That's one thing. It speaks of a new renewed federation of sovereign republics. It also says that all the peoples, irrespective of what nationality they belong to and irrespective of where they live, are guaranteed equal rights and equal possibilities by the Constitution and by the Union treaty. What is unclear here? This referendum is a crucial one. It opens the path to go boldly along to a new, reinvigorated Union. This is of great significance. This will actually decide many things. That is why we will undertake everything necessary to bring things to the conclusion of the Union treaty as soon as possible.

Next: As for the issue of the situation in finances and in the market, I would like to say just a few words, Comrades, on this matter. First, all the strict measures included today in the president's decrees; in the laws that have been adopted by the Supreme Soviet; and, especially, in the decisions adopted by the Union government, all this is what has been agreed within the framework of the economic agreement by all the republics. This was dictated by the emergency situation. We have to get out of shortages. We have to stop the panic buying on the market because, within the panic buying, everything is being bought today, irrespective of whether the family needs it or not. Today, we know this; families have accumulated goods worth 100 billion rubles [R].

Comrade Rasputin, the well known writer Valentin Rasputin, the former member of the President's Council, visited me recently. I had a converation with him. He recently talked to his friends, Muscovites, and he told me that he was surprised that the Muscovites had bought two sacks of flour, and he stood there and said: One can see right away that you are urban dwellers and that you do not know that the flour will simply go bad.

This is what happens not only in this case; this is the case with everything. That is why no market can cope with such panic buying. That is why even the process of transitioning to new prices and increasing the amount of goods, all this should be done simultaneously to stop panic buying.

I don't think it will stop immediately. Of course, Comrades, that's right, and I was questioned at the factory about the measures that would be taken to combat the black market. I think that all these measures, tough administrative-criminal measures, as well as economic ones, must be employed. Let well-known circles criticize the president for that, for the harshness of the laws, for measures that are not in tune with reform. Yes, the decrees passed in the last few months are not, perhaps, in tune with a normal market, but they are in tune with the period of transition toward the market, when it is necessary to stabilize the situation within the country. I am sure that you are in favor of such harshness and such control, since that emerged from all the conversations at the factory.

As for the policy on prices, since all enterprises are moving toward the market and they must sell their

output and make gains, they must all face up to the question: At what price will I sell? Coal does not go on to the market; it goes to enterprises. So, I need a wholesale price. Oil does not to go the market either, but goes mainly on consumption, power engineering, and so on. I, as a coalminer or an oilman, need a wholesale price that makes it possible to live. Yet, within the country hitherto we have been using oil at R30, while we have been selling it on the external market at $120. So, the oilman makes a comparison, and the coalminer does exactly the same. If it was necessary to embark ... [changes thought] It's just the same with metal. Without all that—without power, without metal—the national economy cannot live, and neither can any sector. It was necessary to embark on new wholesale prices. Incidentally, they haven't solved the problems of these sectors, and it has been necessary to create stabilization funds, for which all these percentages have been made, all the percentages have been made, all the percentages about which people talked to me in the workshops and asked about here, as well. To support both the oilman and the coalminer, and so on, we instituted for them wholesale prices that do not yet guarantee profitable work for them. They cannot really live. They must be helped. But, we have been unable to raise the prices for them further, since that means that wholesale prices will surge like a wave throughout the national economy. The whole process will assume an incredible, as it were, scale. We fixed the price for them. We embarked on wholesale prices and made it possible for all enterprises to use contractual wholesale prices, but we fixed them so that monopolists do not fleece consumers. Accordingly, we fixed a level at which if it exceeds normal profitability all the rest goes into the budget. There is no point in his continuing to force up the prices.

Now, about purchase prices [zakupochnyye tseny]. After all, in our country today, Comrades, we sell for R100 billion the agricultural produce that collective and state farms give us, but we subsidize that to the tune of R137 billion to maintain pruchase prices for collective and state farms. That's the situation. One cannot maintain all these prices in such a state, in a distorted state, and move on toward the market. Price reform is needed.

As the first stage, the task is being set not at all so much for the state at the expense of the working people to sort of line its pockets and resolve some problems. No! Therefore, the approach will be as follows: fixed prices are being set for food; all proceeds are used for a 100-percent compensation to the population, except for delicatessen, etc; what was promulgated previously in the autumn remains in force, at free prices. Industrial goods: the main goods—clothing, footwear, children's goods, etc.—have fixed prices, and all earnings [vyruchka]. 100 percent, are returned to the consumer, goes to him. In this way, 85 percent of funds obtained from raising prices will go to the consumer, to be used as compensation, and we'll start compensation earlier than we'll change over to higher prices so that everyone sees in reality, so to speak, what this is. This will happen at the enterprise, and it will be done for the pensioner, in the Army, for the teacher and the doctor.

You'll ask the question: When? I was asked this in the workshop, too. There are no longer any secrets here, because there is no longer anything left to be filched in our shop. That is why, so to speak, as they say, all cards are already on the table here. This morning, work was completed on preparing an agreement to draw up the principles of a pricing policy on retail prices, and I signed a letter to Comrade Dementey and all leaders of the republics asking them to [sign] this agreement which had been drawn up at the Council of the Federation after two or three meetings. This was discussed recently; further criticisms were voiced; everything has been considered, and it seems agreed with the representatives of the republics. Now, it only remains for the leaders of the republics to sign.

We will wait. We have asked for this to be done in three or four days. After this, we will examine and set the deadlines. I would like for us to understand one another here: the center is not at all cooking the books here in order to line its pockets, so to speak, in some area. No! Furthermore, this entire mechanism will, to a considerable extent, be implemented by republics, and they, each of them, are even able to consider their own nuances, the specific features of the republic.

We will continue to proceed toward the market to destatification. The laws are in the Supreme Soviet and are being examined; initiative for medium and small enterprises and the development of enterprise, for this purpose, too, laws are being examined and will be adopted. We want destatification to proceed in our way and not in Western fashion. There are some who do not like that we do it this way, in our own way, but I think that we cannot do it differently. After all, this is our country, our special features. Besides, I think that it is necessary to be more sensible. Some people, just like a fish which is famished after its hibernation goes for any bait, sometimes this is what we do. Western marketeers throw us bait, and we bite, and pass it off as an achievement of scientific thought. They, themselves, thinking privately—and some say so, frankly and openly—you are being given such advice which they themselves would never use.

Therefore, it is necessary to study and see the experience of economies which have had a market for a very long time, but it is also necessary to see our country and our realities and, within this framework, to resolve the questions of the transfer to the market economy. The question has been asked very correctly. If anyone thinks that the market will resolve everything, then this would be a mistake. It would be yet another delusion. Just look at China. It went over to the market. There was a boom in the countryside for three or four years, and then everything stopped, and there was even a slump. You and I know 1 and ½ dozen or 2 dozen flourishing states with market economies, but there are 120-150 with a

market, and all the rest are far from flourishing. That same China has a national income of $300 per head.

What is needed, then? For a market, one needs a serious structural policy so that we should turn our economy—through conversion, through creating new capacities for producing goods—toward people. What is needed for this, primarily, is time and resources. Second, what is needed is a scientific-technical policy and scientific-technical progress. Without this, there will be no economizing of resources or labor productivity; without this, there will be no high quality products. Therefore, we will move in all these directions. We have the conversion program. A state program is being elaborated in our country regarding structural policy and scientific-technical progress to correct what there was before. Of course, we should, as Ivan Ivanovich said correctly here, attend to the basic sectors without which there is, so to speak, no basis for the whole economy.

This whole complex of complicated problems in the economy, and in reforming the Union, and in democracy should be resolved so that the whole complicated system of interrelations in the country should be clearly determined and begin to function normally. Here, at this stage, what is very necessary is effective executive power. In short, now, these months and this year will have a decisive importance. I hope for cooperation, for understanding, and for restraint, and this applies not only to you. Despite my critical attitude, I can see a great deal of common sense, healthy proposals, well-founded demands, but I appeal from this rostrum, from this tractor builders' hall, to all the working people of the country to display all of these qualities. Thank you for your attention.

Now, if you do not object, I will move on to answering questions.

Comrade Grishan asks: How do I feel in the two roles of president and general secretary? The second question: Do you think it is an urgent matter to carry out a reregistration, an exchange of party tickets, in the CPSU?

I think that it is only in the past month or two that people have stopped actively discussing the first question. I am sure that at the present very complicated stage, which is a transitional one in the life of the country and of the party, itself, the uniting of these posts is, to some extent, perhaps, even detrimental in that it restricts my possibilities for work as president. All the same, I think that with new structure, where there is a deputy general secretary, this is still essential, for the party, itself, needs support. Also, the president should have as his base a definite political force, and I consider that our party is such a force.

For all the criticism being directed against it, that does not remove the part which it has played and continues to play. We will never allow ourselves to swallow the bait which says, you see, that the party has become obsolete and that the party is guilty of everything and to blame for everything. No! The party is millions of people representing all strata of our society, and such an accusation, let me tell you, is a provocation, with certain political aims, not in the interests of our common cause.

How do I feel? I have enough work. I don't know for how long I will be up to it, but I don't think that is a topical question now, so to speak. In any event, I will do everything to avoid letting down the working people and Communists, among others. As far as reregistration is concerned, this subject is in circulation now; the exchange of party cards, this subject is in circulation now. I think the most important thing now is to do the work which we have begun, on the basis of the decisions of the congress and the program statement. Ultimately, the party...[changes thought] I must tell you directly, information coming in now shows that, after this, Communists, overcoming serious illnesses and experience, have started operating actively. Both in soviets at all levels and in labour killektivs, raising their voices in defense of the policy of perestroyka, they are participating actively in all discussions and the elaboration of policy, and this helps the new authorities, those who have truly taken on the burden of responsibility for implementing the policy of perestroyka. That is the most important thing. This is a subordinate question, which can be discussed later.

Lenin was very solicitous in his treatment of his comrades-in- arms, Kamenev, Zinovyev, Trotskiy, and others. Despite mistakes committed by them, Vladimir Ilyich did not expel them but corrected them. In the years of perestroyka, you have lost Yeltsin, Yakovlev, Shevardnadze, Bakatin, and, finally, Ryzhkov. What is your own attitude to this?

As they say, those surnames have been well muddled up. First, Comrade Yakovlev, Aleksandr Nikolayevich, is an adviser of mine. He was a member of the Presidential Council and remains an adviser. I intend to propose Comrade Bakatin to the Supreme Soviet for a place on the Security Council. As for Comrade Ryzhkov, Nikolay Ivanovich, with whom I have come a long way, starting in 1982, in the search for an answer to the questions with which life has confronted society, we have been and remain friends to the end. In particular, Nikolay Ivanovich is already home now. I had a chat with him recently. He is already feeling quite well now, although it happened as it did. The illness has put him out of action, so to speak. I think, perhaps, it is his right and sovereignty to decide what he should do in future. As for Comrade Shevardnadze, you know the whole story. To be frank, it was my choice of Comrade Shevardnadze, whom I have known since our Komsomol years, for the post of foreign minister.

It surprised many people not only in the Soviet Union but also in the whole world, especially in the world. As it turned out, he was the very man who really made a huge contribution toward implementing the policy of perestroyka, as regards its foreign policy. His decision, you know, it was his own decision. I personally did not share

the choice he made, and I don't see any need to force a man to carry out his duties in such a high office; this is not such a case. At parting, when I spoke at the Foreign Ministry, I said that I hope that, having found himself in a new situation, Comrade Shevardnadze will continue to make a weighty contribution to the continued struggle for implementing the policy of perestroyka. Now he is setting up a diplomatic association which will be uniting the country's creative forces on a volunatary basis, which will be cooperating with official bodies and will be providing their analyses and voice its proposals. I think it will be useful.

Finally, the name of Comrade Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin remains. By the way, there was a question on it. I think everything would have been very simple, Comrades, if everything had boiled down to personal relations, incidentally, to the personal relations between Gorbachev and Yeltsin. No, I think, that's not the point.

You have probably got to know Gorbachev a little bit during all these years, and know that I have a reserve of goodwill, openness, and breadth of views to listen to opinions from all sides. Even more than that, the position of the president obliges him to deal not just with the party that put you forward and that supports you but with other political movements and with all stratas of our people. I think Communists should understand this. Sometimes they make such complaints about me as if by meeting the representatives of other political and public movements, I betray Communists and the party. I think this is not serious. Moreover, the party should free itself from these sectarian views. It announced that it denounces the monopoly on power and is ready to cooperate at all levels and with all patriotic forces interested in our country's prosperity. I share this view, and I will act in this way and not otherwise. I ask Communists to take note of it because sometimes I receive such agitated telegrams, which suspect that the general secretary, the president, somehow did not go in the right direction here. That's why there is a reserve of goodwill, but I must say that's not the point.

It is a question of two political lines, of program goals. This is where the differences lie, and if earlier they were, probably, of a tactical nature—something about which Comrade Yeltsin has also spoken on more than one occasion—I see that having gone onto the platform with proposals of the kind that have been made, then this is no doubt the result of his own choice and it reveals his goals and tasks. I consider that they differ from the goals of perestroyka, and, because of this, everything is considerably more complicated. I'll try today. I've prepared something to say at the meeting with representatives of science and the intelligentsia. I'll try to present this subject more broadly so as to throw light on it. But, there are many questions here about the system of taxes.

Comrades, everything that we are now carrying out is unpopular. It is of an extraordinary nature. It is calculated for 1991, and all the republics got together and signed economic agreements for 1991 to get the situation in hand. Therefore, even if right now you press me hard into a corner, as they say, we can't give up all of these measures, tax measures, and all of these financial measures which we are implementing, because this is necessary to step on the throat of the deficit; to normalize the financial situation; and, at least, to take large steps. Therefore, I can't concede. We will do what is planned, Comrades. We need to endure this period of time and to take the situation in hand more quickly. This is the point of these measures, extraordinary measures, calculated for this year. The majority of them will be unpopular.

## TASS Notes Remarks on Yeltsin

*LD2602154191 Moscow TASS in English 1508 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Excerpts] Minsk February 26 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev today called for suspending hostilities in the Gulf. Speaking to the staff of the Minsk tractor-building works, he urged "preventing a bloodbath". [passage omitted]

Speaking of the domestic situation, Gorbachev said that instability in society, political and social tensions and collapsing economic ties were posing "a great threat to all our economy".

He stressed the priority need to "progress towards a market system more quickly and achieve a Union treaty as soon as possible".

Gorbachev said that "republics should be full masters within the framework of their sovereignty and new powers", while the centre should only be concerned with defences, the fuel and power sector, railways and communications.

He said that representatives of republics working on the draft Union treaty would finish it "by March 5 at the latest", after which the document would be sent to all members of the Federation Council.

Gorbachev expressed the conviction that the forthcoming referendum on March 17 on the future of the USSR "will open possibilities for bold moves towards a new, renovated Union".

"I see our Union as strong republics and a strong centre," he added.

Speaking of the situation on the consumer market, Gorbachev said that continuing panic buying and hoarding could only be stopped by increasing the supply of goods along with prices on them.

He disclosed that a draft agreement between the centre and the republics on principles for pricing policy and retail prices had been completed today. After it was signed within the next three to four days by the leaders of the republics, the schedule of the price hikes would be determined, Gorbachev said.

Asked to comment about Russian President Boris Yeltsin's recent televised interview, he said that Yeltsin's

objectives "are at odds with the goals of perestroyka". "What is at issue is two political lines and associated strategic goals. The difference is in them," Gorbachev said.

### Points Out U.S., Gulf Comments

*LD2602143391 Moscow TASS in English 1409 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Excerpts] Minsk February 26 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev, who arrived in Belorussia today, told local workers he was strongly against abandoning perestroyka reform policies.

Speaking at a meeting with the staff of the Minsk Tractor Works, he said that dropping those policies "would be the greatest mistake we could ever make". [passage omitted]

President Mikhail Gorbachev called for halting hostilities in the Gulf.

In his address to the work collective of the Minsk tractor-building plant he said a telegram had been received from President Saddam Husayn of Iraq last night. The telegram says Iraq is beginning to withdraw its troops from Kuwait.

"We immediately let the United States know and instructed the Soviet Union's envoy to the United Nations Yuliy Vorontsov to press for the urgent consideration of Iraq's statement in the U.N. Security Council," Gorbachev said.

It is necessary to settle this conflict and put on the U.N. agenda the solution of the entire Middle East problem, the Soviet president said. "Without solving it, we shall preserve the powder keg there which can blow up the world. What has happened in the Middle East shows how pressing the issue is," Gorbachev said.

Stressing that Soviet-U.S. dialogue is in the focus of normalization of the situation in the world, Mikhail Gorbachev noted that progress in relations between the Soviet Union and the United States is still very "brittle". He said "a great sense of responsibility" was needed on order not to destroy what has already been achieved.

### Gorbachev Pledges Chernobyl Funds

*LD2602181591 Moscow TASS in English 1736 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondents Tatiana Khriapina and Yevgeniy Gorelik]

[Text] Minsk February 26 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev, who is visiting Belorussia, has met the Republic's parliamentarians on Tuesday afternoon.

In a brief speech he told parliamentarians that a Union law had been drafted upon the initiative of the governments and parliaments of Belorussia, the Ukraine and Russia to ensure social protection of citizens afflicted by the Chernobyl nuclear power plant disaster.

The law envisages, the president stressed, maximum social and material privileges for people who took part on the clean-up or temporarily living on radionuclide contaminated territories. At the same time, the law will enable pooling efforts by all republics, all Union ministries, departments and research centres to find ways of prompt and effective overcoming of the consequences of the disaster.

Gorbachev noted the principled stand by the parliament and Government of Belorussia in defending the vital interests of the people who had suffered from the Chernobyl blast.

"Your persistent demands to speed up the solution of Chernobyl problems are quite fair and lawful," he said. "The national government will take effective steps to fully meet your demands. The Union budget which was very difficult to shape this year, includes a special section envisaging considerable outlays to liquidate the consequences of the Chernobyl trouble".

The president praised the republic's stance toward the radical problems of perestroika. "This stance is balanced, responsible and based on principle," he stressed.

"Belorussian comrades understand that it is necessary to live in a new way, dismantle outdated structures and economic barriers that brake our progress, but at the same time not to discard outright the good experience of the preceding federations, not to disrupt age-old traditions of people's friendship and mutual respect".

Later in the day, Mikhail Gorbachev met Belorussian scientists, writers and representatives of creative unions and intelligentsia.

### Meets Unionists, Intelligentsia

*LD2602171191 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[TASS special correspondents report from Minsk]

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev this evening met with the collective of the republic's Academy of Sciences, and with representatives of the creative unions and Minsk intelligentsia. The conversation between the USSR president, scientists, and cultural figures noted the large role of the intelligentsia of Union republics in deepening democratic transformations in society, and in strengthening traditions of friendship between the peoples of the country. It was stressed that the expansion of fundamental research in Belorussia would create a reliable basis for modernizing technologies, improving the culture of production, and protecting the environment.

### Departs for Gomel Oblast

*LD2702083791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0804 GMT 27 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Tatyana Khryapina]

[Excerpts] Minsk 27 Feb (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, in Belorussia for the second day, left Minsk for the Gomel Oblast this morning. This oblast particularly suffered as a result of the accident at the Chernobyl Nuclear Electric Power Station in April 1986. [passage omitted]

It is expected that the USSR president will visit the rayons where the radiation level is still very high and will meet the inhabitants of the oblast center.

### Arrives in Vetka District

*LD2702101391 Moscow TASS in English 0958 GMT 27 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondent Tatyana Khryapina]

[Text] Gomel February 27 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev, on a tour of Belorussia, today arrived in Vetka, a district centre of the Gomel region.

Vetka is one of the areas hit hardest by radioactive contamination following the Chernobyl nuclear power plant accident in 1986. The Vetka district and a number of other neighbouring Belorussian areas are partly included into the 30-km zone around the damaged reactor.

Living conditions have somewhat improved here thanks to clean-up measures. For full safety, however, local inhabitants should be resettled into radiation-free areas.

Gorbachev familiarised himself with the state of affairs in the district, talked with people. In the afternoon, the president intends to visit the regional capital, Gomel.

Gomel is the republic's second largest industrial and cultural centre after Minsk, the Belorussian capital. Its population is half a million.

### More on Belorussia Chernobyl Compensation Law

*LD2602205191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1845 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[By TASS correspondents Vladimir Glod and Aleksandr Kryzhanovskiy]

[Text] Minsk, 25 Feb (TASS)—A law "On the social defense of citizens who suffered from the catastrophe at the Chernobyl nuclear electric power station [AES]," has been adopted in Belorussia.

A quarter of the territory of Belorussia, on which more than 2 million people live, was affected by radionuclides. In the 3 years since the accident, the general rate of development defects among the newly born in the republic increased by 18 percent, and in strictly monitored areas of Gomel and Mogilev Oblasts, the increase is even greater. The law will not only protect inhabitants of "sick" land, but will also help save the future of the Belorussian nation—in 1988 in the republic, of children born in the republic, 63.3 percent were completely healthy, in 1989, only 53.3.

The law defines four zones, in accordance with the density of whose radioactive pollution an evacuation will take place, where compensation payments will be made for living in stricken territories, and social benefits for troubleshooters [likvidator] will be allocated.

The most complex issue is where to find the roughly R6 billion necessary to implement what has been planned. The republican budget deficit amounts to R3.5 billion. The resolution on bringing the law into effect says that all expenditure linked with its implementation will be compensated to the republic by means of resources from the Union budget, and the Belorussian Council of Ministers is instructed to take the specific steps necessary.

There are still several documents in the "Chernobyl" package of the Belorussian parliamentarians. The next of these on the agenda is the law "on the status of territories stricken as a result of the Chernobyl AES catastrophe."

### Donbass Committees Meet on Anticipated Strike

*LD2602221291 Moscow TASS in English 2125 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] Donetsk February 26 TASS—The regional union of strike committees in Donbass failed to reach a unanimous decision on the forthcoming strike at its meeting in Donetsk today, UKRINFORM correspondent Vladimir Yurkevich reported today.

The meeting confirmed earlier demands to double pay to miners and streamline retirement pension legislation. Representatives of strike committees voiced dissatisfaction with the progress of talks with the federal and Ukrainian governments. But then a rift occurred during the discussion of the proposed miners' strike.

Some speakers called for a 24-hour strike on March 1 and its resumption on March 11, if the two governments fail to take specific measures to meet the demands within ten days.

Others insisted on the resumption of the strike on March 1, still others insisted that the action should be adjourned to win time for preparations for a nationwide strike.

As a result of repeated voting, none of the proposals gained the necessary majority.

The Donetskugol Association strike committee told the meeting that it had already decided to stage a 24-hour strike on March 1.

### Czechoslovak-Ukrainian Talks on Repatriation Start

*AU2602215791 Bratislava NARODNA OBRODA in Slovak 25 Feb 91 p 5*

[CTK report: "Repatriation"]

[Excerpt] Moscow— The names of about 960 persons are on the list of Ukrainian Czechs from the area affected by the accident of the Chernobyl reactor who are getting ready for immigration to the CSFR on the basis of the Federal Government's Resolution No. 905. Although the Ukrainian authorities have not given any official political consent, their stand on the repatriation is favorable and they have established good conditions for the work of the relevant Czechoslovak bodies. As Zdenek Huml, CSFR deputy consul general in Kiev, told the CTK correspondent after the first round of official Czechoslovak-Ukrainian talks on the repatriation issue, which were held in Kiev on 12 and 13 February, the only questions that remain to be solved are, for the most part, of technical nature. The final decision on individual families and persons will be made in the second round of the talks, to be held in July. The progress of the whole process is borne out by the fact that this second round of talks will be attended by a representative of the CSFR Ministry of Finance, who will deal with the problem of the transfer of the immigrants' financial resources. [passage omitted]

### Ukraine, Lithuania Sign Economic, Trade Protocol

*LD2602191191 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2200 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[Text] Lithuanian Deputy Prime Minister Vytautas Pakalniskis and Viktor (Kurchyukin), deputy chairman of the Soviet Ukraine Council of Ministers, signed an economic and trade cooperation protocol for the current year in Kiev today. This document concretizes the bilateral agreement on cultural, economic, and trade cooperation signed nearly three months ago. Each of the countries has projected selling each other goods worth approximately 900 million rubles. Lithuania expects to obtain from the Ukraine approximately one-tenth of the total amount of goods purchased from the Soviet Union, except for some metallurgical and metal processing and chemical enterprise production, especially vital for Lithuania.

## Caucasus

### Georgia's Gamsakhurdia Sends Letter to Lukyanov

*AU2602204191 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian 0500 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Letter signed by Zviad Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, sent on behalf of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia to Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet—date not given]

[Text] Dear Anatoliy Ivanovich,

Having familiarized itself with the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On the State of Affairs in the South Ossetian Autonomous District and Measures To Stabilize the Situation in the Region," the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia considers it necessary to state the following:

First and foremost, we wish to protest the fact that, as of old, you refer to us as the Georgian Soviet Socialist Republic instead of the Republic of Georgia.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia positively assesses the fact that the USSR Supreme Soviet confirms the territorial sovereignty of the Republic of Georgia and the necessity of uncovering and punishing all illegal armed formations and halting the illegal manufacture and spread of weapons, and that the path to a resolution of the conflict lies not in the imposition of a state of emergency throughout the whole of South Ossetia with the involvement of USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] internal troops—something which would lead to an escalation of tension in those regions that are totally unaffected by the conflict and where Ossetian militants have no support at all—but in the immediate disarming of the Ossetian extremists who are ensconced in Tskhinvali and Dzhava rayon armed with the latest military equipment.

The deployment of USSR and Republic of Georgia MVD troops throughout the region will only weaken [words indistinct] the possibility of implementing action to establish peace. We also cannot ignore the political assessment of the use of USSR MVD troops in those regions which are unaffected by the conflict and where Ossetian and Georgian families live peacefully together. There are many such regions outside the boundaries of the former district [South Ossetia] where 100,000 Ossetians live. What is most important is to use the existing Georgian and USSR MVD internal troops in order to make it impossible for the Ossetian militants to carry out extremist acts on territory inhabited both by Georgians and Ossetians in the Tskhinvali and Dzhava rayons. The MVD of the Republic of Georgia assumes responsibility for guaranteeing the security of the population in the remaining regions of the former autonomous district.

The resolution does not take account of the fact that the electric power blockade was implemented by the Independent Union of Electric Power Workers in response to the manufacture of weapons in factories under the control of the Ossetian militants and inaccessible to Georgian law enforcement organs; it is impossible to cut off the supply of electric power only to these factories.

As regards the suffering of children, the sick, and the elderly, the Georgian Ministry of Health and the [Georgian] MVD repeatedly offered to take them to a safe zone, but this offer was refused. They have remained the hostages of the militants. [words indistinct] At present, there are no political forces in the region which are capable of holding talks on the settlement of the conflict.

[words indistinct] and none of them have the power to put a halt to the actions of the militants.

The Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia is ready to hold talks with representatives of the Ossetian population in Shida Kartli [area of Georgia into which South Ossetia has been incorporated by the Georgian Government] who have such competence but on condition that, at the same time, effective measures are implemented in order to stop the actions of the militants and to guarantee complete security in the area in which there is a state of emergency. Failing this, it will be impossible to avoid [words indistinct] representatives of the Ossetian side who are conducting talks on a settlement of the conflict.

In conclusion, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia cannot fail to mention without sorrow that the overwhelming majority of acts of desecration referred to in the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution, acts carried out by traitors on a large number of state institutions, state organizations, the [word indistinct] hall of the district theater, and historical and cultural monuments are being committed by the Ossetian militants and not by the Georgian side as it is being clearly suggested; after all, the district theater that was burgled was Georgian, the schools that were burned down were Georgian, acts which gave rise to retaliation. Somehow, the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution silently ignores the sources of the conflict, a fact which serves to encourage the Ossetian militants and exacerbate the conflict still further.

If we bear in mind the fact that it is the Georgian population which has been driven out of Tskhinvali, it becomes clear who the initiators of those acts of robbery and violence are, which are being blamed on Georgians. In connection with this, we cannot fail to mention the fact that, this morning, Georgia (?has become) the object of [word indistinct] disinformation (?spread) by the mass media. This serves only to exacerbate the already tense situation. This is the reason why the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia is making this protest.

Only the immediate disarming of all armed formations in the region, and, first and foremost, in Tskhinvali and Dzhava, will give us the opportunity to hold fruitful talks on a political settlement of the armed conflict which was started by Ossetian extremists.

This is the contents of the letter sent on behalf of the Presidium of the republic's Supreme Soviet to Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The letter has been signed by Zviad Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the [Georgian] Supreme Soviet.

## Georgian Interior Ministry Continues Arms Seizures

*LD2602192391 Moscow TASS in English 1902 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] Tbilisi February 26 TASS—Interior Affairs bodies in the Georgian Republic continue to seize arms and military equipment from armed groups and various parties.

The republic's Interior Ministry said in a statement released through the SAKINFORM agency today that it had already seized large amounts of firearms, explosives, military hardware, trucks and cars.

We do not aim to seize them by force, because we do not want bloodshed and unjustified losses, the statement stresses. However, the leaders of parties and illegal armed groups who ignore our warnings will have to take full responsibility for the delay or refusal to turn in available arms, the Georgian Interior Ministry stresses in its statement.

## Georgian Leader Discounts S. Ossetian Statehood

*LD2702112191 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 0900 GMT 27 Feb 91*

[Yuriy Rostov report from the "Television News Service" program]

[Text] Georgian leader Gamsakhurdia recently discussed the situation in South Ossetia with the Soviet president. The two held a telephone conversation, in which Gamsakhurdia said that he is in favor of talks among all sides involved in the conflict. But he described as groundless the claims by the Ossetian population for statehood. As is known, the present agenda includes the introduction of presidential rule in South Ossetia.

## 'Extremely Tense Situation' in South Ossetia

*LD2602114291 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] An extremely tense situation is continuing in South Ossetia. Yesterday in the village of Avnevi in Znaurskiy Rayon, unidentified individuals fired on a Georgian militia post. According to data from the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs press center, one militiaman died and two were injured.

In Tskhinvali a rally was held. Approximately 1,500 people took part. Those assembled demanded that the Georgian leadership lift the blockade and that (Torez Bylymbekov), one of the leaders of the autonomous oblast who was arrested earlier, should be released.

Thanks to measures by the USSR internal services troops, the Georgian and Ossetian hostages seized yesterday have been released.

In the last few days the electricity supply in Tskhinvali has been restored for six hours.

## Oleynik Interviewed on South Ossetia Situation

*PM2702094591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 26 Feb 91 First Edition pp 1, 4*

[Interview with writer B.I. Oleynik, USSR people's deputy and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, by S. Shevtsov; place, date not given; first paragraph is introduction: "Boris Oleynik. Conversation Following His Return From South Ossetia: 'This Conflict Is Singeing the Whole Country'"]

[Text] I met writer B. Oleynik, USSR people's deputy and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of Nationalities, in blockaded Tskhinvali. Asked to give our newspaper an interview, Boris Ilich replied: "It is still too early to draw any conclusions from the trip. I still have to meet members of the public and Georgia's leadership..." When we parted, he said: "Until we meet in Moscow..."

[Shevtsov] So, Boris Ilich, what sort of impressions did you bring back to Moscow?

[Oleynik] Depressing. I think that there is no point in unambiguously naming the culprits. Both peoples are suffering.

But let me remind readers that the indicator of a society's civilization is determined by its citizens' attitudes toward the Constitution. Whether bad or good, until such time as it is amended, it remains a sacred law. If some leaders scornfully and offhandedly breach the Constitution, it is the people who pay for such games with their blood.

To a certain extent, the proclamation of the South Ossetian republic provided an impulse for the exacerbation in the region. This act is contrary to the Constitution currently in force, and this is noted in the relevant decree by the USSR president. The Georgian side acted in exactly the same unconstitutional manner when it wiped off the status of the South Ossetia Autonomous Oblast.

As a writer and a human being, however, I find none of this paramount. The paramount point for me are the "sanctions"—if I might use the expression—which bring suffering to thousands of people and are introduced not by the republic's government but, for example, by self-organized [samodeyatelnyy] organizations like the independent union of Georgian power industry workers. This is blatant lawlessness which is impermissible in a civilized state. Electricity and water supplies have been turned off, there is no heat...

We visited a hospital. The temperature in the operating theater was down to 6 degrees [centigrade] below zero. There are no medicaments or dressings. Operations were being done under a kerosene lamp. Stooping old women in a home for the elderly and disabled said: "Now we know that we will die of the cold." Fatal cases involving the supercooling of newborn babies have been recorded in maternity homes.

We also visited a bakery plant. It is operating at just one-third of its capacity—using a solar power source. There have been occasions when baking had to be suspended for periods of up to 96 hours.

The Kostya Khetagurov Theater has been demolished. Unique historical costumes have been plundered. Safes have been broken open, documents lie scattered all over the place, equipment has been smashed. Khetagurov's statue has been defiled...

[Shevtsov] While you were in Tskhinvali, Boris Ilich, were you told how men wearing militia uniforms fired automatic weapons at the red flag above the oblast soviet executive committee building until it was shot down by heavy machine-gun fire?

[Oleynik] Yes, they fired at the Soviet flag. A training operation...

[Shevtsov] You also know that there have been cases of Ossetian villages being plundered and homes set on fire. There is not a single living person, not a single living creature left in some villages. Did you tell Z. Gamsakhurdia, chairman of Georgia's Supreme Soviet, about all this?

[Oleynik] We told him about everything we saw, including the fact that Georgian homes have also been set on fire. But all sorts of mistakes and all sorts of tragedies can occur against such a "radiation" background, when the situation is confused and the Constitution is not obeyed.

First of all, there are some guerrillas without "identification signs" operating in South Ossetia in addition to those who are known. Second—there is multiethnic racketeering. Taking advantage of the confusion, people who are fond of lining their own pockets—criminals and marauders in other words—have rushed to South Ossetia from all corners of the country. This is why we need a most thorough investigation by the competent organs. The chairman of Georgia's Supreme Soviet himself admitted that he cannot fully control the situation because of combat formations outside his authority.

[Shevtsov] In other words, Georgia's leader is himself beleaguered by guerrillas?

[Oleynik] Of course, since there are those who do not obey Z. Gamsakhurdia: Iosceliani's and Tsareteli's formations, for example, as well as others.

[Shevtsov] But why does Z. Gamsakhurdia not decide to extend the effect of the state of emergency throughout the territory of South Ossetia? Then the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Internal Troops will manage to cope with the armed gangs plundering peaceful villages.

[Oleynik] Z. Gamsakhurdia assumes that the guerrillas do not operate beyond the boundaries of the state of emergency zone. But we told him: "They do." And he can see this for himself. But Zviad Gamsakhurdia is

suggesting to further arm the Georgian militia which will then disarm these detachment.

[Shevtsov] What detachments actually? Ossetian? Georgian?

[Oleynik] I would also like to have this clarified. If someone believes that it is possible to disarm just one side, this is no solution to the problem. Both sides must be disarmed. But will the Georgian militia cope with this by itself? I personally doubt it, because even the tiniest anomaly would be interpreted as a sign of bias and the nationality factor could come into play at full force. It seems to me that it would be advantageous for the Georgian side as well if this knot were to be unraveled with help from the USSR MVD Internal Troops.

We visited General Patrikeyev, commander of the Transcaucasus Military District. He is categorically opposed to his subordinates taking part in any operations of this kind. But we know that provocations against servicemen in Georgia have become more frequent. For example, someone recently smashed the windows of the home of the commander himself.

I am very much afraid that an even sadder fate may lie in store for our Army, especially in the Transcaucasus. I am shocked by society's unconcerned and indifferent attitude toward events in the Persian Gulf. War is thundering just some 160 km away from our country as the bird flies. Aircraft are flying along our fatherland's borders, with Yerevan and Baku perfectly visible from high altitudes. We must also bear in mind the fact that the Transcaucasus Military District is face-to-face with the theater of military operations in the Persian Gulf. For the time being the prevailing winds are blowing from our side. But come the spring, wind directions will change, sand storms will begin, temperatures will rise to 40 degrees... After all, some very alarming news items have already started arriving: About 100 persons living close to one of the bombed special enterprises in Iraq have died of an unidentified disease.

In the face of this threat, the leadership of Transcaucasian republics would find it worth while to cast all ambitions aside and prepare to repel any possible calamity, prepare means to protect the population. And the last hopes here are pinned on the Army. War is on our threshold, and yet we engage in interethnic feuds and get carried away by the struggle for power. After all, we will have to work together to save ourselves. Seeing that the U.S. Congress has already heard it said that tactical nuclear weapons might be used to protect soldiers' lives, we are consequently not that far off the start of World War III.

Our dangerous indifference today reminds me of 1941. And unless we stretch our hands out to one another now, we will see—if you would pardon the crudeness—stretched out bodies.

[Shevtsov] You are right, Boris Ilich, but I still cannot erase the memory of burned out and destroyed villages, or the instructions given to me by a school teacher from Tskhinvali: "You tell them over there, in Moscow, that our leaders are not Kuwaiti amirs. War is being waged on our land..."

[Oleynik] True enough, the dangerous and tragic nature of events within the Union should not be underestimated. We deputies were also asked by people in Ossetia: "Is the Kremlin asleep?" Of course it is necessary to act. After all, death does not differentiate along ethnic lines—it is not Georgians or Ossetians, it is not Russians of Jews who are dying, it is people, simply people. This is why measures must be taken immediately, and specific measures at that.

Z. Gamsakhurdia emphasizes that the independent trade union of Georgian power industry workers, which cut off electricity supplies to South Ossetia, is not accountable to him. This trade union put forward several demands, and promises to lift the blockade only if they are met. One of the main reasons given for cutting off electricity supplies is their claim that two of Tskhinvali's plants were supposedly manufacturing arms. I told Zviad Konstantinovich that this point can be resolved: Set up mixed commissions and station them at these plants, in the capacity of military representatives [voyenpred].

To continue. There is an unprecedented demand addressed to the military to withdraw Ossetian servicemen from Soviet Army units stationed in South Ossetia because, in the Georgian side's opinion, it is through them that weapons reach the guerrillas. I do not know whether there is any direct proof of this. At least no such proof was shown to me. But the Transcaucasus District commander is prepared to honor this point as well.

In my view, however, this alone would be sufficient for the sides to meet halfway and turn on the electricity supply...

[Shevtsov] Did you manage to find out anything about what has happened to Torez Kulumbegov, chairman of the South Ossetia Oblast Soviet Executive Committee, and the dozens of Ossetians who are classed as missing?

[Oleynik] We brought the list of missing persons to Moscow. These people are being sought.

Kulumbegov was arrested. I asked Zviad Konstantinovich whether Kulumbegov could be handed over to the Union organs of justice, as requested by the Ossetians. He replied: "We will try him ourselves..."

[Shevtsov] I spoke with Kulumbegov's wife. She wept, saying: "How can they accuse him of inciting hatred for Georgians, . myself am Georgian, he gave Georgian names to our sons, he has never said a bad word about the Georgians..."

[Oleynik] I also have not heard even a hint of a bad word about Georgians from the Ossetians. They perceive this conflict as political—they have no desire to secede from the Soviet Union.

[Shevtsov] In a recent television interview you emphasized the special acuteness and complexity of this conflict when compared with others. What specifically, in your view, is the source of its peculiarity and acuteness?

[Oleynik] The peculiarity is due to the fact that many Ossetians live directly amidst Georgians. If the spring of the conflict is compressed further still, you can imagine where it all might end: The desire for vengeance might come into play... To continue. The physical features are such that, if the only highway along which food supplies can travel to South Ossetia is cut, the population will find itself totally blockaded.

[Shevtsov] It is well known that the guerrillas have already taken advantage of this opportunity once, by blowing up a rock which cut off the highway. The military are now clearing the obstacle.

[Oleynik] There are both Ossetian and Georgian refugees. Let me emphasize this once more: Both peoples are suffering. The point is that the Ossetians unambiguously want to remain within the Union. The nations' right to self-determination must remain sacrosanct. But it is also necessary to remind both sides once more that nobody is allowed to breach the Constitution.

[Shevtsov] Boris Ilich, the Crimea, for example, has also proclaimed itself a republic but nobody is being suffocated by a blockade or killed by anyone else there...

[Oleynik] Thank God for that! Long may they prosper!

During a recent meeting with U.S. congressmen, I said that the situation in the Baltics resembles the situation in South Ossetia specifically in the breaches of the Constitution. But I was amazed by our guests' selective approach toward human rights issues. While correctly condemning violence in the Baltics, for some reason they did not utter a single word about the Persian Gulf where hundreds of totally innocent people are dying every day.

Earlier I had doubts about the priority of human rights over a nation's priorities, and on one occasion I even submitted an amendment to this effect at a party congress. Now that I have visited the "hot spots" I am convinced that human rights have priority above all else.

I am convinced that, unless the sides show good will and meet each other halfway, even the involvement of an arbitrator will be of no use. It is necessary to gather courage and overcome ambitions. After all, the peoples used to live together normally.

[Shevtsov] What did you tell the country's Supreme Soviet about your trip? What decisions by the center can be expected in settlement of the situation around South Ossetia?

[Oleynik] As soon as both our deputies' delegations returned to Moscow from North and South Ossetia, we briefed Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, who in turn immediately briefed Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, on what we had seen, outlining our opinions regarding possible ways to stabilize the situation. My impression from the conversations was that both M.S. Gorbachev and A.I. Lukyanov are extremely worried by events and are carefully following the situation. We also briefed the current session of the country's Supreme Soviet on the results of our trip.

Following a highly acute and thorough discussion of the problem, the Supreme Soviet adopted its resolution. It has been published. It is intended to send a government commission to Tbilisi and South Ossetia to conduct on the spot talks on settlement of the conflict. It is also intended to invite the leadership of Georgia and South Ossetia for talks in Moscow.

[Shevtsov] We both have seen that soldiers and officers of the Internal Troops are sharing all the hardships and dangers with the South Ossetian people. I learned, by the way, that these subunits had been on "long-term secondment" in Azerbaijan and Armenian prior to Tskhinvali. And our editorial office still receives letters from soldiers' mothers asking: "For how long will our children pay for the political leadership's mistakes with their health and their lives?"

[Oleynik] I have already said words to the effect that the time has come for us to stop exposing our soldiers, our own children, to the lead barrage of interethnic feuds. While in Tskhinvali I met soldiers and officers of the Internal Troops. One can only take a deep bow in recognition of their courage and patience. They never ask "For how long...?" but stoically perform their soldier's duty and obey their oath. But we must give some serious thought to the question of protecting our soldiers. After all, they are also exposed to the bullets of slander and insults: "Occupiers..." This is impermissible in any civilized country, but is, unfortunately, possible in our own country. In my view, the center's response on this count is not always suitable. A vacuum is created which is quickly filled by negative and tragic developments.

[Shevtsov] Boris Ilich, I do not think that writer Eduard Limonov can be "accused" of holding procommunist views. It is well known that, for a long time now, he has been surveying our country from Paris, from the side as it were. Thus, he believes that the Soviet leadership is failing to take decisive measures to impose order because of a mental reservation: "Just in case the West says that we are not democrats."

[Oleynik] I share Mr. Limonov's opinion to the extent that elementary order is needed for democracy to be preached. This is universally known. But our home is in a state of disorder. If the legitimate government is breaking the laws, how can it expect respect?

I am also worried by the fact that our intelligentsia, which dug the tunnel leading to perestroyka, is nowadays keeping silent in many cases when the need arises to save the people and perestroyka. In this context, I was pleased by the address signed by D.S. Likhachev, Igor Shklyarevskiy, and other literary figures, calling for a halt to the bloodshed.

To a certain extent we all pretend to be ordinary people despite our exalted status: No one wants to stick his neck out. If you say something against so-called radicals, you are likely to suffer humiliation and even threats. There are instances of direct physical violence against people with different opinions. That selfsame Mr. Limonov is already pretty fed up with yesterday's champions of dissidents.

[Shevtsov] Has this pressure not extended to you yet?

[Oleynik] I cannot say that my circumstances are anything special. But I do feel the pressure. Telephone calls and lengthy threatening scribbles on the apartment door in Kiev, anonymous letters... Of course, if you are in favor of the Union, a union of sovereign states at that, you are almost a traitor of the national idea. The local champions of political "pluralism" are cruel people. They would hesitate at nothing.

I personally do not consider myself a hero. I am afraid of threats. I know that those who wrote that I was a nationalist back in the sixties are now writing that I am "the Kremlin's stooge." These people need commotion in society so as to have someone to struggle against. It does not matter who, as long as a struggle is waged—they are incapable of doing anything else. For the time being, those who are making a career in nationalism and scoring points off tears and blood, are anticipating the center's actions. A kind of mad race is being run...

Generally speaking, I agree with President Nazarbayev of Kazakhstan: There is no need to wait until all republics agree to sign the Union Treaty. Let it be signed by those that have voluntarily realized the expedience of this action on a nationwide scale. As for the rest, those that want to can join, those that do not want to—well, it is their sovereign affair. Incidentally, Kazakhstan's president is soundly fighting for his own people without overlooking the other peoples' interests. This is the internationalism which we have vilified. And this should not have happened. Sovereignty can be arrived at only in accord. This applies to all, including the leadership of the peoples of Georgia and South Ossetia.

## South Ossetia Held in 'Firm Grip' of Blockade

*LD2602190291 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0000 GMT 26 Feb 91*

[Text] South Ossetia is still in the firm grip of an economic and energy blockade. The temporary press center of the emergency committee of the Supreme Soviet of North Ossetia Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic reports that the water supply to Tskhinvali is still seriously interrupted and that illegal pickets near the village of Akyekhevi continue to block the road. On Sunday in Tskhinvali, a several-thousand strong rally of representatives of Ossetian nationality adopted an appeal to the president of the USSR. It says no matter what the results of the forthcoming referendum in Georgia, South Ossetia has made its choice. It will remain part of the USSR.

Humanitarian aid is reaching Vladikavkaz from various regions of the country. On Monday alone, motor vehicles carrying food, medicine and warm clothing arrived from Moscow, Leningrad, Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays and Kursk Oblast. Tbilisi, in its turn, has reported that the Ossetian side is carrying out wide-scale attacks upon the Georgian population, militia posts and even subunits of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD]. There are casualties.

The press center of the MVD of Georgia has reported an attack upon the village of Avnevi. Six citizens of Georgian nationality died and 10 were seriously injured.

## Armenia's Ter-Petrosyan on Talks About NKAO

*NC2702112591 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1730 GMT 25 Feb 91*

[Report by Gevorg Nazaryan from the Armenian Republic's Supreme Soviet session on 25 February—recorded]

[Excerpt] [Nazaryan] Of late numerous issues are being debated at the session. Yet, no matter what their importance is for the progress of our republic, the people have come to believe that Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast] and its troubled life have been relegated to oblivion. Probably there is no need to blame such people, for they lack enough information about all the things being done by our republic's leadership, in particular by Republic Supreme Soviet Chairman Levon Ter-Petrosyan. Such people are quick to pass judgment. Of late Ter-Petrosyan has often been absent from the session. Few knew what he was engaged in and what he was doing. Suffice it to say that from 11 to 18 February the chairman of the republic's Supreme Soviet was in Moscow. This time his mission was unlike previous ones in the sense that it was undertaken at his own initiative. As he himself stated at the morning session, he had prepared a package of measures on Artsakh for presentation to the responsible organs in Moscow. Addressing the people's deputies, Levon Ter-Petrosyan stated:

[Ter-Petrosyan] It is obvious for us all that at present the only real thing that could be achieved concerning the Artsakh problem is the restoration of the oblast soviet. This will enable us to have a working counterpart in Artsakh with which Armenia could fully cooperate. Our opponents, in both Azerbaijan and Moscow, have no grounds for not restoring the oblast soviet. Logic and right are on the side of the people of Artsakh. But, the fact is that the existing situation in Artsakh is extremely advantageous for the Azerbaijani authorities.

As you are already aware, since last September we have been in contact with the Azerbaijani authorities and the relevant organs in Moscow and have been trying to find common points to resolve the situation. I had a series of meetings with [Azerbaijani President] Mutalibov both separately and in the presence of and with the participation of the Moscow authorities. In addition, meetings were held between the Armenian and Azerbaijani legislative delegations. During these contacts a package of

measures was worked out which envisaged a step by step resolution of the situation in Artsakh, with the first condition again being the restoration of the oblast soviet. But the negotiations revealed that Azerbaijan could drag out these negotiations for years without resorting to any concrete steps. For, as I said, the present situation is advantageous for Azerbaijan.

We became convinced that these negotiations would produce no results at all unless Artsakh were present at these negotiations as an entity of its own. They will produce no positive results at all unless the oblast soviet is restored to represent the interests of Artsakh. We were able to convince Moscow of this. Moscow also became convinced that in fact Azerbaijan has no intention of restoring the oblast administration.

As you remember, at the latest congress of the USSR Supreme Soviet Gorbachev referred to the Artsakh problem following the Armenian delegation's boycott of the congress as a sign of protest. Gorbachev had to express his position on this issue. He was forced to confess that so far the Artsakh problem has not been resolved and that it should be examined at either at the Supreme Soviet or the Federation Council. But, I will add here that the Federation Council does not have any specific status and can only undertake consultative debates, (?but can take no votes). (?No votes) are taken at the Federation Council. It can pass no decisions. It is simply that the president sounds out the Federation Council for his decrees; this is the way to put it. He issues his decrees after obtaining consent. Therefore, the only constitutional body which could pass a decision is the Supreme Soviet or the president himself who could settle this issue by a decree.

Anyway, based on the documents we took there, the president formulated a presidential decree on the Artsakh problem whose fundamental points were: First, to restore the oblast soviet within two months by bypassing the republican authorities—that is, to hold the elections under the supervision of Moscow's Union Monitoring and Observation Commission. That is, the republic was kept out of those elections. For us, this was an [word indistinct] acceptable formula because we were convinced that the republic was not going to organize these elections. Second, to pull out from Artsakh those Azerbaijani militia forces, the ones called Special Purpose Militia Detachments [OMON], which were introduced there in the last few months. The Azerbaijan Supreme Soviet was also called upon to review its decision on the dissolution of Shaumyanovskiy Rayon. These were the fundamental points. The remaining points of this decree virtually repeated the points found in the 28 November resolution. There are a number of important articles in that resolution which are quite acceptable to us.

This decree was formulated in the form I presented to you. Mutalibov's agreement was obtained. He too was in Moscow. [Supreme Soviet First Deputy Chairman] Lukyanov and later [Chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet] Nishanov were also involved in this affair. [Words indistinct] the endeavor somewhat faltered when the circle of participants was enlarged. Nevertheless, by 16 February the decree was present and was on the president's table and it was expected that it would be signed before the opening of the [USSR Supreme Soviet] session. We always feared that Azerbaijan could apply pressure and that at the last moment the president would refrain from signing it. On 16 February [Armenian Prime Minister] Vazgen Manukyan was also in Moscow, and we were ready for any possible discussion of the issue in the Federation Council. We were both there, but this issue was not raised at the Federation Council.

After the meeting of the Federation Council, the next day, Sunday 17 February, we held a meeting with the Armenian people's deputies at the USSR Supreme Soviet and drew up a relevant scenario for raising the issue at the Supreme Soviet in case the decree was not signed. As I said, this fear existed and there were grounds for it as Azerbaijan could have applied pressure in the meantime and aborted the signing of the decree. In fact, that is what happened. On the morning of 18 February, it transpired that Mutalibov had gone to Baku on Saturday and despite the fact that a full agreement had been reached with him on the text, apparently once there he too was pressured as [Secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee] Dashdamirov, [Second Secretary] Polyanichko, and others interfered in the issue and constantly phoned to warn Moscow that such a decree would be regarded as a violation of Azerbaijan's sovereignty given the fact that it empowers the central authorities and not the republic to organize elections inside the republic. They also warned that this would create a new wave of disturbances in Azerbaijan.

That is, the Azerbaijani factor again came into play this time around. The existence of this factor is evinced by what happened in Sumgait, Baku, and Kirovabat. This factor was an effective one. It is time for us to realize that in effect we have no means to apply similar political pressure. Unless we muster such political pressure and become a political partner with our distinct and resolute policy measures, Moscow will not negotiate with us on this issue. But on the other hand, Gorbachev has no alternative, as wittingly or not the nonexistence of the oblast soviet is a glaring injustice. At a time when a referendum is being planned in the Union for the future of the Union, for a place to exist without soviet rule is quite absurd. Therefore, in any case a solution has to be found. The idea has matured, the work in Moscow is still continuing, and in particular our people's deputies are continuing to meet Lukyanov, Gorbachev, and Nishanov. They have not given up the idea of a decree. I maintain that it will be signed when our political pressure and political measures counterbalance those of Azerbaijan.

This is all I wanted to tell you about this issue. It appears to me that we have to draw relevant conclusions in this regard and that the republic should be able to have its say in this issue [passage omitted] [end recording]